

from the 15th day of January, 1902, vice Lieut. Commander Carlos G. Calkins, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Edward F. Qualtrough, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 9th day of February, 1902, vice Commander Henry B. Mansfield, promoted.

Pay Inspector Ichabod G. Hobbs, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 28th day of April, 1902, vice Pay Director Edward Bellows, retired.

POSTMASTERS.

John T. Lindley, to be postmaster at Ontario, in the county of San Bernardino and State of California, in place of John T. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Benjamin J. Maltby, to be postmaster at Northford, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in place of Benjamin J. Maltby. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

William E. Stouffer, to be postmaster at Breckenridge, in the county of Summit and State of Colorado, in place of Maude E. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

George S. Avery, to be postmaster at Galena, in the county of Jo Daviess and State of Illinois, in place of George S. Avery. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

William H. Whitehouse, to be postmaster at Mount Olive, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois, in place of Philip Rodenberg. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1902.

Frank Rockwell, to be postmaster at St. Charles, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois, in place of Frank Rockwell. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

Joseph S. Morgan, to be postmaster at Dubuque, in the county of Dubuque and State of Iowa, in place of Joseph S. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Harry E. King, to be postmaster at Maquoketa, in the county of Jackson and State of Iowa, in place of Harry E. King. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1902.

Benjamin A. Nichols, to be postmaster at West Liberty, in the county of Muscatine and State of Iowa, in place of Benjamin A. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expires May 28, 1902.

Joel P. Deboe, to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Hickman and State of Kentucky, in place of James A. Deboe. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1902.

Joseph W. Gary, to be postmaster at Caribou, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine, in place of Joseph W. Gary. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1902.

Thomas G. Herbert, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Sagadahoc and State of Maine, in place of Thomas G. Herbert. Incumbent's commission expires May 24, 1902.

William H. Foote, to be postmaster at Westfield, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts, in place of William H. Foote. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Charles McKerlie, to be postmaster at Sturgis, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Michigan, in place of Erastus T. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

James H. Williams, to be postmaster at Whitehall, in the county of Muskegon and State of Michigan, in place of James H. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1902.

Frank B. Lamson, to be postmaster at Buffalo, in the county of Wright and State of Minnesota, in place of Frank B. Lamson. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1902.

Charles E. Callaghan, to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Olmsted and State of Minnesota, in place of Charles E. Callaghan. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1902.

Fred A. Swartwood, to be postmaster at Waseca, in the county of Waseca and State of Minnesota, in place of Fred A. Swartwood. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1902.

Ira L. Kirk, to be postmaster at Bozeman, in the county of Galatin and State of Montana, in place of William B. Burket. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

E. D. Turner, to be postmaster at Delamar, in the county of Lincoln and State of Nevada, in place of Alexander I. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

Abram W. Boss, to be postmaster at Flemington, in the county of Hunterdon and State of New Jersey, in place of Abram W. Boss. Incumbent's commission expires May 24, 1902.

Edward W. Martin, to be postmaster at Hoboken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, in place of Leonard Schroeder. Incumbent's commission expires May 28, 1902.

William O. Armbruster, to be postmaster at Weehawken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, in place of William O. Armbruster. Incumbent's commission expires July 7, 1902.

Charles Eichhorn, to be postmaster at West Hoboken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, in place of Charles Eichhorn. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1902.

Marcus L. Wood, to be postmaster at Frankfort, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York, in place of Marcus L. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1902.

George T. Salmon, to be postmaster at Lima, in the county of

Livingston and State of New York, in place of George T. Salmon. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

Amanda E. Morris, to be postmaster at Hendersonville, in the county of Henderson and State of North Carolina, in place of Amanda E. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

Thomas N. Tarbox, to be postmaster at Cedarville, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio, in place of Thomas N. Tarbox. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1902.

Henry Thomas, to be postmaster at Cuyahoga Falls, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio, in place of Henry Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1902.

John P. Barden, to be postmaster at Painesville, in the county of Lake and State of Ohio, in place of John P. Barden. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1902.

John W. Morris, to be postmaster at Piqua, in the county of Miami and State of Ohio, in place of John W. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1902.

Thomas L. Flattery, to be postmaster at Wooster, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio, in place of Thomas L. Flattery. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1902.

William W. Henderson, to be postmaster at Brookville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Pennsylvania, in place of William W. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

David W. Morgan, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Venango and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Elisha W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1902.

Charles A. Dunlap, to be postmaster at Manheim, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Christian J. Reiff. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

James Ewart, to be postmaster at Colfax, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington, in place of James Ewart. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Lewis S. Patrick, to be postmaster at Marinette, in the county of Marinette and State of Wisconsin, in place of Lewis S. Patrick. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

John P. Bennett, to be postmaster at Yazoo City, in the county of Yazoo and State of Mississippi, in place of James E. Everett, removed.

Alexander Y. Jones, to be postmaster at Renovo, in the county of Clinton and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Robert N. Roberts, deceased.

Allen H. Webster, to be postmaster at Cuba, in the county of Fulton and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

George E. Sapp, to be postmaster at Pecos, in the county of Reeves and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 22, 1902.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

John Gardner Coolidge, of Massachusetts, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Peking, China.

SECOND SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Henry P. Fletcher, of Pennsylvania, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States at Habana, Cuba.

POSTMASTERS.

J. W. Stauffer, to be postmaster at Pittsfield, in the county of Pike and State of Illinois.

Adele E. Barnes, to be postmaster at Delavan, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 22, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The following prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.:

Our Father, who art in heaven, we thank Thee for that inherent love of liberty which from time immemorial has inspired men to deeds of heroism and glory, and which gave to our fathers the spirit of 1776, which added a new nation to the world, a government of the people, by the people, for the people, and that under its benign influence and guiding hand a new republic has just been born in the Western Hemisphere. God grant that the people of Cuba may appreciate the right to think for themselves, to act for themselves, and enjoy the fruit of their own labors; that they may use, but never abuse, those precious privileges; that they may grow intellectually, morally, and spiritually, and become an added instrument in Thy hands for the spread of Thy Kingdom upon the earth. In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

THOMAS WELLS.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of House bill 12576, to increase the pension of Thomas Wells, the beneficiary has died. Therefore there seems to be no necessity for this bill going to the President, and I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the House has been informed that since the passage of the bill (H. R. 12576) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wells the said Thomas Wells has died: Therefore,

Resolved, That the said bill (H. R. 12576) be transmitted to the Senate with the request that it reconsider the vote whereby it passed the said bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken and the resolution was agreed to.

USE AND IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNORS ISLAND, BOSTON HARBOR.

The SPEAKER laid before the House House joint resolution 113, authorizing the use and improvement of Governors Island, Boston Harbor, with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. CONRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM D. TANNER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 6360) granting an increase of pension to William D. Tanner, with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MATILDA E. CLARKE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 12418) granting a pension to Matilda E. Clarke, with Senate amendments, which were read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

CATHERINE F. EDMUNDS.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report, and I ask that the reading of the report be dispensed with and that the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report and that the statement be read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The report of the committee of conference is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1172) "An act granting an increase of pension to Catherine F. Edmunds," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments.

H. C. LOUDENSLAGER,
J. H. BROMWELL,
WILLIAM RICHARDSON,
Managers on the part of the House.
J. H. GALLINGER,
J. R. BURTON,
PARIS GIBSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the conferees was read, as follows:

This bill originally passed the Senate at \$35 per month, but was amended in the House to \$30 per month. The result of the conference is that the House recedes from its amendment, and your conferees recommend that the bill pass at \$25 a month, as it originally passed the Senate.

H. C. LOUDENSLAGER,
J. H. BROMWELL,
WILLIAM RICHARDSON.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the immigration bill; and, pending that motion, I desire to state that I have agreed with my colleague on the other side that general debate should cease at this time. I now ask unanimous consent to confirm our agreement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12199, being the immigration bill; and pending that motion asks unanimous consent that general debate be now closed. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question now is on the motion of the

gentleman to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BOUTELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12199. General debate having been closed, the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill by paragraphs.

The Clerk read as follows:

That there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of \$1.50 cents for each and every passenger not a citizen of the United States, or of the Dominion of Canada, or of the Republic of Mexico, who shall come by steam, sail, or other vessel from any foreign port to any port within the United States. The said duty shall be paid to the collector of customs of the port or customs district to which said alien passenger shall come, or, if there be no collector at such port or district, then to the collector nearest thereto, by the master, agent, owner, or consignee of every such vessel, or by the alien passenger, if such alien passenger comes overland, within twenty-four hours after the arrival of such vessel in port, or by such overland alien passenger upon application for admission.

The money thus collected shall be paid into the United States Treasury and shall constitute a permanent appropriation to be called the "immigrant fund," to be used under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury to defray the expense of regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States under this act, including the cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts, and digests thereof, for the use of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, and the salaries and expenses of all officers, clerks, and employees appointed for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this act. The duty imposed by this section shall be a lien upon the vessel which shall bring such aliens to ports of the United States, and shall be a debt in favor of the United States against the owner or owners of such vessels, and the payment of such duty may be enforced by any legal or equitable remedy; and if any such alien seeking admission overland refuses or neglects to pay such duty as hereinbefore provided he shall be refused admission to the United States, and if found subsequently to have obtained admission thereto after such neglect or refusal, he shall be deemed and adjudged to be unlawfully therein and may be deported, as is provided hereinafter for the deportation of other aliens found unlawfully in the United States: *Provided*, That the Commissioner-General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, by agreement with foreign transportation lines, as provided in section 33 of this act, may arrange in some other manner for the payment of the duty imposed by this section upon aliens seeking admission overland, either as to all or as to any such aliens.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 25, page 2, after the word "immigration," insert the words "under the direction of."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. PAYNE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13895) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 593) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of the Northern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 43.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Committee on Enrolled Bills, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 533) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a national sanitarium of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota, are hereby authorized to strike out the words "Branch Home" from line 12, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the word "sanitarium."

IMMIGRATION.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SHATTUC. I send up the amendments of the committee. Mr. POWERS of Maine. I desire to be recognized after it is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee amendment has already been read by the Clerk, but without objection the Clerk will again report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 25, after the word "immigration," insert the words "under the direction of."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the Committee amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to have some explanation why this should be done.

Mr. SHATTUC. The amendments are to section 1, page 1, line 8; insert after the word "States" a comma instead of a period. And after the same word insert the following: "Or by any railroad or any other transportation." It is suggested that by

using the word transportation we might include all means of transportation, including steamboat, railroad, or omnibus, or whatever kind of transportation used. Then in line 12, section 1, after the word "vessel," strike out the words "or by the alien passenger if such alien passenger comes overland, within twenty-four hours after the arrival of such vessel in port or by such overland alien passenger upon application for admission" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or transportation lines." This is done at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Then, on line 25, page 2, after the word "immigration," insert the words "under the direction or;" that is to take the initiative away from the Commissioner-General and leave it with the Secretary of the Treasury as it is now.

Mr. PERKINS. Are those all the amendments offered?

Mr. SHATTUC. That is all that has been offered up to this time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for a moment, to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask in reference to one question which I could not understand in the bill as it is printed. I presume it will be explained by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does it pertain to this question?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. SHATTUC. What is it?

Mr. PERKINS. The bill as it reads says:

There shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of \$1.50 for each and every passenger.

That first section as it reads would impose a tax of \$1.50 on each and every passenger that comes to this country, whether he comes here to reside or whether he comes here for the purpose of business only. I have looked through the act to see if there was not some explanation by which this section should be modified so that it would only impose the tax upon those persons who are aliens coming here to reside, and not upon anyone who came here simply for the purpose of business. I have not found it in the act, but I am not as familiar with the act as my friend from Ohio, and I ask him where is the provision?

Mr. SHATTUC. What provision?

Mr. PERKINS. Which says that the tax is to be levied only on aliens coming here to reside.

Mr. SHATTUC. If the gentleman will read the bill which he has in his hand he will see that it excepts American citizens, citizens of the United States, of the Dominion of Canada, and of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. PERKINS. But suppose the man comes from England?

Mr. SHATTUC. Then he would pay a dollar and a half tax.

Mr. PERKINS. The intention is to tax every man who comes from England on business, every traveling agent, every member of an embassy, or a tourist from England, and to say that he shall pay a dollar and a half to get into the United States?

Mr. SHATTUC. The passengers do not pay it; the steamship companies pay it.

Mr. PERKINS. Is that the law now?

Mr. SHATTUC. That is the effect of it. I presume it has been so for twenty-five years.

Mr. PERKINS. And the tax is collected on every traveler?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. A dollar and a half a head?

Mr. SHATTUC. Not a dollar and a half, but a dollar. If the gentleman will look at the type in which the language is printed, he will see that it is the old law.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not care what type it is printed in; I want to know what these provisions are.

Mr. SHATTUC. If I have my way, the law will be that every passenger pays, or the company pays, a dollar and a half on every passenger that comes to the country, except citizens of the United States, citizens of the Republic of Mexico, and of Canada. For all others that come here we will collect from the company one dollar and a half apiece.

Mr. PERKINS. That would apply to everyone that comes here by railroad?

Mr. SHATTUC. It is so now.

Mr. PERKINS. The railroads pay a dollar and a half a head?

Mr. SHATTUC. The railroad company.

Mr. PERKINS. Is there any other civilized country outside of China that levies a tax of this sort upon people coming into the country?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes; \$5 a head.

Mr. PERKINS. What country?

Mr. SHATTUC. Australia.

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, very likely.

Mr. HILL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Do I understand that a person coming from England to spend a week in the United States for business purposes or for pleasure that a tax is laid of a dollar and a half for coming into the country?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes; but the steamship company pays it.

Mr. HILL. They pay a penalty for coming into the country?

Mr. SHATTUC. No. They pay their share of the police expenses, expenses attending inspection, and other expenses attending it.

Mr. HILL. Is it not about time we stopped it?

Mr. SHATTUC. No; I think not.

Mr. RAY of New York. Let me inquire of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHATTUC. Well.

Mr. RAY of New York. Do you say that if a man comes in here by railroad he pays a tax?

Mr. SHATTUC. I have answered that ten times, and it seems to me that a great constitutional lawyer like the gentleman from New York should not ask the question again.

Mr. RAY of New York. Will the gentleman kindly answer my question? I do not see it.

Mr. SHATTUC. The gentleman does not see what?

Mr. RAY of New York. It says every passenger who shall come by steam, sail, or other vessel from any foreign port to a port in the United States.

Mr. SHATTUC. That refers particularly to vessels.

Mr. RAY of New York. The bill does not say so.

Mr. SHATTUC. That is in the middle of the bill. The gentleman will find it if he reads the bill through. Mr. Chairman, I ask a vote on the amendment.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I see that this proposition exempts persons from the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico. I do not know from whence, except from those two places, anybody could come into the country by rail.

Mr. SHATTUC. The persons coming in pay this tax without knowing it, because it is paid by the steamship companies, who charge it over to the passenger.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to ask a question. Suppose an Englishman, residing at some city on the other side of Lake Ontario, comes to the city of Rochester, where I reside. The fare on the steamer is \$1; but coming from Toronto, he would under this bill, as I understand, be obliged to pay an additional \$1.50, though his only purpose in coming to Rochester may be to buy something from Rochester merchants. In other words, if this proposed law should be enforced—I do not know that it will be—it is going to cost a man who is not born in Canada \$1.50 in addition to the \$1 fare in order to come to Rochester and do business. This is my understanding of the bill, and I would like to know whether it is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to hear the amendment read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "immigration," in line 25, page 2, insert "under the direction or."

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is not the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment just read is an amendment proposed by the committee. The Chair will state that a good deal of the discussion has apparently been directed to a series of amendments which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] has sent to the Clerk's desk, but which have not yet been reported. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] presents a series of amendments, the first of which will now be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1, page 1, line 8, by inserting after "United States," a comma instead of a period, and then inserting after the word "States" the following: "Or by any railway or by any other mode of transportation from foreign contiguous territory to the United States."

Mr. McCALL. I should like to ask the gentleman who proposes this amendment whether it is necessary for a person coming into this country by rail, if he is not a citizen of Mexico or Canada, to pay \$1.50 under the existing law?

Mr. SHATTUC. A citizen of Canada will not have to pay it.

Mr. McCALL. Then, would not the effect of the amendment which the gentleman proposes be to require the payment of that tax in order to come into this country by railroad?

Mr. SHATTUC. Not at all.

Mr. McCALL. Then I did not understand the amendment as it was read.

Mr. SHATTUC. I have stated distinctly that citizens of the Dominion of Canada, citizens of Mexico, and citizens of the United States are to be exempt.

Mr. McCALL. But, as I understand, anyone else than a citizen of Canada or of Mexico or the United States coming to this country by rail would, under the operation of the gentleman's amendment, have to pay \$1.50 tax, and that is not the existing law.

Mr. SHATTUC. I said that \$1.50 was not the existing law; they pay \$1 now. We increase the tax by adding 50 cents. The old law provides a tax of \$1.

Mr. McCALL. I may have a wrong copy of the bill; but as I understand, the bill now before the House provides simply for this tax upon those who come by steam, sail, or other vessel; and the gentleman from Ohio proposes as an amendment to add those who come in by any transportation line.

Mr. SHATTUC. That is the law now.

Mr. McCALL. That is what I would like to have explained, because I do not see in the present law (which is printed in Roman type in connection with this bill) the provision to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. SHATTUC. An amendment will be offered correcting that—inserting in lieu thereof "or transportation lines," which will include railroad lines. That part of the bill is not very plain and will be corrected.

A MEMBER. How is the tax collected?

Mr. SHATTUC. The tax is collected by agreement of the Canadian lines, and they pay the tax themselves.

Mr. McCALL. Is there anything in the existing law including transportation lines in that general way?

Mr. SHATTUC. There is nothing that specifically provides who shall collect the tax on the Canadian lines. It is made permissive with the Canadian lines to make an arrangement with our Government officials, and they have been making such an arrangement for twenty years.

Mr. McCALL. Is that by law or by agreement?

Mr. SHATTUC. By law they are authorized to make the arrangement. In another part of this bill it is provided that this may be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, there are some things about this amendment that I want to be heard upon. Under the existing law of to-day, if a man not a citizen of Canada, if I may use that term, or subject of Canada, living in Canada, crosses over into the State of Maine to do any trading or visiting, he does not pay a dollar and a half every time he or any of his family come across the line. I live in a town right opposite the city of Woodstock, where we interchange visits frequently, and parties cross the line between the two countries for trade purposes every day. Nobody ever thinks of collecting a dollar and a half for the visitors or persons coming over to trade or for any other temporary purpose.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does the gentleman know why not?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. There is no law authorizing it.

Mr. SHATTUC. We do not make them pay here in this country, because they would retaliate at once and make our people pay over there.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. This amendment would make it imperative upon them to pay a dollar and a half if they were not citizens of Canada, as the bill calls the subjects of Great Britain living in Canada.

Mr. SHATTUC. Not at all.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Then I can not understand the meaning of the English language.

Mr. SHATTUC. Then the gentleman can not understand the English language. He ought to. It is very plain there that the citizens of Canada are exempt from the operation of the law.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. The term "citizen of Canada" is used. I was not aware that there is any such term as "citizen of Canada." If you will change that to "resident of Canada"—

Mr. SHATTUC. It is subjects of the Dominion.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. They are subjects of Great Britain and residents of Canada. If the gentleman will change that to "residents of Canada," excepting all persons residing in Canada, then I think the bill may not be subject to so much objection as it now is.

Mr. SHATTUC. I will say to the gentleman that long before he and I became statesmen this was the law as it is now.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I think not. There is no such law that I ever had my attention called to, and I have been a collector of customs along the frontier for some years, and had something to do with these matters.

Mr. SHATTUC. The gentleman means about the citizens of

the United States and those of the Dominion of Canada. That is the law now.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I believe that if you were to apply this to persons who crossed our border as they do up in the vicinity of the home of my friend from New York [Mr. PERKINS], and as they are doing in my own place, that instead of having it read "citizens of Canada," for there really is nothing of that kind, it should read "residents of Canada."

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Offer that amendment.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I will, perhaps, when the time comes—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Now is the time.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. After this amendment has been adopted I may offer an amendment to change the word "citizen," in line 5, to "resident."

Mr. LESSLER. Offer it now! Offer it now!

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment would destroy the restrictive character of this bill. All a man would have to do would be to move into Canada, where he becomes a resident, not a citizen, and then he would be free to cross the border into the United States, and the whole scope and object of this bill would be nullified. The term "resident" would impose no length of residence in order to establish it as the term "citizen" might under the laws of the country, and it would simply open the doors to the migration into this country which we are now trying to restrict and nullify the object of this bill, and especially the new features which have been engrafted on it at the request and demand of the laboring classes of the country. You might as well not pass this bill as to say that every resident of Canada—not a citizen, but a resident—can cross the boundary lines of the United States and come in. Why, all migrations from Europe would come to Canada and become residents and then cross the border.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think anybody would become a resident of Canada to save a dollar and a half. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. They would become a resident of Canada for one day—

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. That would cost a dollar and a half, would it not?

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman thinks the steamship tax of a dollar and a half is of no importance. I will state that it is of such importance that it is diverting the passenger traffic to the Dominion lines of Canada, and the matter that interests the gentlemen from New England so much is the transportation on their railways down into the interior of the country. It is of sufficient importance to do that. A man will remain a resident of Canada for one day, come in in that way and escape the tax, and it will nullify entirely the purposes of this bill, which are to stop the migrations through the open doors of Canada, which is one of the great evils of which the Treasury Department now complains.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I do not raise the objection for any such purpose as is indicated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS]. I raise the objection for the reason that I believe it will prevent persons from coming across the border for trading or visiting or anything of that kind, whether it be up on the northern border of New York or on the border of Maine. And at the proper time I purpose to offer an amendment to strike out the word "citizen," in line 5, and insert instead thereof the words "subjects of Great Britain, bona fide residents of Canada."

Mr. ADAMS. What is a bona fide resident?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. One who has his home honestly there; not one who has gone there, as the gentleman seems to think they would, to escape the payment of a dollar and a half and expend \$25 in doing it.

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, no.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Now, I should like to ask the gentleman, who is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as well as the Immigration Committee, and knows much more than I do about matters of this kind, what do we understand by citizens of Canada? Is there any such class of persons? I live on the border, and I never heard of them. I have heard of subjects of Great Britain residing in Canada and I have heard of Canadians.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say in reply to the gentleman that this very House has put that term into the Porto Rican bill and declared the inhabitants of the island of Porto Rico to be citizens of Porto Rico.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. That is an entirely different case.

Mr. ADAMS. So we have that distinction, which has been made by the House of Representatives. I will say to the gentleman, so far as the question of international law is concerned, that the term "citizen" is well understood to be a man who owes allegiance to a country and is subservient to its laws. The term "resident" has no such significance.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. The language of this bill complained of by the gentleman from Maine is existing law and has been in the immigration laws of the United States since 1882 at least. I have a copy of it here.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Does it apply to railroads?

Mr. RUCKER. It applies to the class of people in Canada that this bill applies to.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Will you please answer the question? Does the existing law apply to persons coming over the frontier on railroads?

Mr. RUCKER. It says:

That there shall be levied a duty of 50 cents for each and every passenger not a citizen of the United States who shall come—

I see it says—

by steam or sailing vessels.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I thought so. They cross back and forth—hundreds of them every day—on the railroad, to and from my town.

Mr. McCALL. As there seems to be a question here as to what the existing law is, I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUCK] that he permit this amendment to be temporarily passed over, in order that we may find out just what the existing law upon this point is. Of course if it is existing law I should be inclined to vote to reenact it; but if it is not existing law, then I think the committee should consider it more carefully.

Mr. PERKINS. It is not existing law.

Mr. McCALL. If it is not existing law, the committee has not been correctly informed.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] that this provision has been put in the bill in order to cure the great evil that now exists, the coming in through the door of Canada of persons whom we desire to keep out. Unless I am very much mistaken it is a new provision of law, and it is put in for the very purpose which this bill is trying to accomplish, which the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS] will almost utterly destroy.

The information which comes to us from the Treasury Department to-day is that the law is being evaded through the transportation facilities by way of Canada. So great is this evil that recently the Treasury Department has sent additional inspectors to the various points of transportation on the Canadian frontier to stop it. The laws to-day are being almost nullified by the abuse of the open door through Canada, and the attention of the committee having been called to this fact, this provision was put on the bill both at the request of the Treasury Department and of the labor organizations of the country, to remedy this evil. I do not wish to repeat, but it is a very important matter; and if the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS] is engrafted upon this bill and residents of Canada are allowed to come in, it would defeat the purpose of the bill, which is to try to remedy this ingress through the ports of Canada into our country.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] admits now that the provision embodied in this amendment is not a part of the existing law. It seems to me that it should not become a part of the existing law. It is an absurdity on the face of it that any person desiring to come into this country from abroad would come around by way of Canada and stop there in order to acquire a legal residence for the sake of saving a dollar and a half.

Now, if the gentleman can draw up an amendment so that people who come here from abroad—I mean from across the seas—by way of Canada shall pay \$1.50, there can be no objection. But in New England we have very intimate trade relations with Canada. We have a great border commerce, and people are crossing back and forth constantly, and we do not care to have the annoyance of citizenship being inquired into and this special tax levied on passengers who are traveling, for instance, from Chicago to Boston by way of Canada or in returning to Boston also by way of Canada. It seems to me an unreasonable provision to put in this bill, that people coming to and from Canada upon business or for only a temporary purpose, should be required to pay this tax of \$1.50. I hope that this provision will not be embodied in the law.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that this particular phraseology is the happiest that might be inserted in this bill, but something ought to be done, in my judgment, for the restriction of immigration. Almost every proposition that we have had that would have been restrictive has been defeated in this House by the local interests of gentleman who do not want to interfere with the trade of their particular towns. [Applause.] Now, I think that the word "passenger" is the better word. I think it will tend to keep out these people who are coming now through Canada. A gentleman near me just now told me that one Canadian steamship line has advertised that immigrants who can not get through at the port of New York can through Mon-

treah, and it is because we have not this real restrictive provision that ought to be in the law.

Again, Mr. Chairman, there is a large number, a very large number, of people who come here every spring from the Mediterranean ports. They come in February and March. They work during the summer season, and in the fall they go back by the thousands. I think that those people ought to be kept out. If you try to do it by the use of the word "immigrants," they say they are not immigrants; they are "tourists;" they are "visitors;" it is not their intention to reside here, and hence the steamship company will not pay this fee. I want something done that will be restrictive of this immense immigration.

I received in my mail yesterday a communication that I suppose contains a statement of facts. Among others is a comparison for January, February, March, and April of 1900 and 1901 and 1902 of the immigrants coming into this country. In the four months of the first year 149,000 came, in the second year 154,000, and thus far this year—I am speaking of the four months this year—230,000 have already come.

If that ratio is kept up, 700,000 of these people will come here during this year. Now nearly half of them are laborers—men and women. They are adults. We are giving to these people a participation to that extent in our labor field. Mind you, they are not the class of immigrants that we used to have. Years ago, when the immigration was large, it came from Great Britain, from Germany, and from the northern States of Europe; all welcome here, making good citizens; but now the immigration in a large degree is coming from the eastern borders of Europe and from the south, and in very many instances—in the majority of instances—they are not desirable additions to our population. Five years from now under a lax administration of the naturalization laws these people would be voters. I do not want the voting power of the United States diluted in that way. I want to see everything that is restrictive in this bill retained in it, and would be glad if much could be added to it. I would rather double that tax than to add simply the 50 cents that this bill proposes to the present law.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with every word that has been said by the gentleman from Iowa, and I go a great deal further. I think the immigration question is the most serious question before this country; but I believe that this tax of \$1.50 will not keep one single immigrant out of the United States of America. I do believe that this tax of \$1.50 on persons coming from Toronto to Rochester is a mere incumbrance of trade, and at the same time it will not keep out one immigrant, desirable or undesirable. Let this committee do what they should do, if they want to check immigration, and have some means by which they can do so without requiring a tax of \$1.50. What does that amount to in the way of keeping an undesirable immigrant from coming in? To prevent this undesirable class of immigrants coming in you must provide some other means than this tax. I say that this provision of a \$1.50 tax on every passenger will not stop a single one from coming in.

You simply have a provision which, if enforced, may be annoying, and interfere with legitimate trade between Canada and the United States, and will no more stop the tide of immigration than it will stop the tide of the Atlantic Ocean. So do not let my friend divert us from the question, which is a proper question to be decided here. Let him bring in an amendment by which immigrants will be turned back, and I will join with him, but when it comes to a mere annoying trade provision which, if enforced, will create incalculable annoyance to business and will not stop one immigrant coming in here, I see no reason for it. There is no reason for foolish legislation because we can not get wise legislation.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the gentleman not know that the great difficulty is in distinguishing, in the hurry of this investigation, between the passenger and the immigrant? You can not distinguish, you can not get the evidence to show that a man is an immigrant if he, who knows all about it and is a stranger, asserts that he is here for a temporary purpose—that he is going back. The only way you can make it exclusive is to recognize him in the character that you know he is; you know he is a passenger and you can not know that he is an immigrant. His friends are with him and they can all join in the same statement that he is coming here for a temporary purpose. There is no possible way of overcoming that without you keep tab on these men during a period of five years, and that is utterly impossible. So that if you change that word, in my judgment you take the substance out of this bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. PERKINS. I want to answer the gentleman from Iowa first. But first, I would like to ask him a question. Does the

gentleman from Iowa think that any man who desires to be an immigrant and come into this country to live will be turned back because he is required to pay 12 shillings for the privilege?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know, but I know that many and many a family coming here have expended everything they had to get here.

Mr. PERKINS. Quite right.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think if there was an additional cost put upon their passage perhaps they would not come, and it is in the hope that they would not, that is, the class I have heretofore spoken of from eastern and southern Europe, that I favor this provision. I hope that they will not come, and it is because of that that I want this as one of the restrictions. It is not sufficient in itself, but it is one restriction, however, and I would multiply them to keep them out if I could.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa. One at a time is sufficient.

Mr. ADAMS. It is a hard question.

Mr. PERKINS. It is a hard question. If the gentleman from Iowa will join in voting to impose an educational test, he will find it will stop many more than a tax of 12 shillings. He says no man can tell an immigrant from a man that is coming here on business. If my friend lived in New York he would not have made that statement. The great body of immigrants—

Mr. HEPBURN. Why, I spent three months in investigating this matter, and I have seen thousands of these people where the gentleman has seen one.

Mr. PERKINS. If a man can not tell a man coming from Italy and Poland or Hungary when he comes in on the train from Canada and reaches the port of New York—if the inspector can not tell the difference between such a man and that of an English-speaking man living in Canada—he must be a dull inspector.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, he could tell that; but he could not tell from his appearance how long he was going to sojourn in the United States, and that is the real question.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a mere police and sanitary measure. It excludes beggars and insane persons, anarchists, and other classes inimicable to the public peace, public morality, and public health. It aims at that and nothing else. It does not aim to prevent the incursion of the hordes that annually come to this country for the purpose of temporarily engaging in mining, working in the lumber camps, and manufactories, and in railroad construction, intending to return to their own country when they have saved a small competence. It does not pretend to prohibit or prevent the addition of these hundreds and thousands of stalwart, able-bodied laborers to the number already at work in this country. Its enactment would not prevent the owners of our coal mines from populating the regions in which they are located with classes of alien laborers socially unfit for citizenship, who care nothing about citizenship, and are therefore essentially disqualified from becoming Americans.

Its enactment would not put an end to the systematic promotion of undesirable immigration by the steamship companies. As for the provision forbidding the owners of the trans-Atlantic lines from thus promoting undesirable immigration we all know it will not have a feather's weight in preventing the evil practice. As long as the law tolerates the addition of undesirable alien laborers to the laboring classes already here, the steamship companies will continue to promote the business they have heretofore fostered so carefully.

When this bill shall become a law (if it does become a law), how easy it will be for the Congress responsible for it to claim credit for the passage of a more stringent immigration law? From the beginning of this controversy down to this hour the demand of the workers in this country has been that the stalwart 6-foot laborer, capable of competing in the labor market with those already toiling for a living here—not the organ grinder or the beggar—shall be excluded. No effort has been made to meet this demand. This bill does not even squint at it. It is a wise police regulation.

In the interest of the maintenance of the public peace it excludes the anarchist, felons, and in general the lawless classes. In the interest of the public health it excludes those suffering from noxious diseases. But what have these restrictions to do with the greater and graver question involved? Absolutely nothing. From the beginning the laborers of this country have demanded the prevention of immigration, which is adding vast hordes of the lowest classes of European pauper labor to our population. We all know that this incursion of undesirable classes among the laboring classes is reducing the standard of living and the level of civilization in every city in the country and among all callings in which manual labor engages. Not only the seaboard cities, but all our large cities and the mining camps of Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Kansas, Colorado, and other mining States and nearly all places where there are manufac-

turing communities will soon cease to be American communities and become mere colonies of brutalized aliens, thousands of whom do not seek to learn our language or desire to learn the nature of our institutions. They are tempted to come to our shores by the one consideration that they can obtain a little better wages, save a little money, and return to their native countries after a term of years. Is the American Congress going to respond to the demand for the suppression of this kind of immigration?

The time is coming when a mere stump speech on the hustings by a lawmaker, citing the passage of such a measure as this, will not be received in quittance of our obligation to limit the immigration, not of beggars, cripples, organ grinders, and thieves, but of able-bodied laborers, most of whom are brought here by the great corporations and "captains of industry."

Mr. Chairman, I need not cite any proof that the complaints of the American laborer, who is the sufferer from this great evil, are just.

The tenement houses of our cities are infested by classes unknown in America a quarter of a century ago. Everywhere we see evidences of a change in the character of our laboring population. In every mining camp, in the industrial hives in our cities, on the construction trains—everywhere—we see men on whose countenances are stamped unmistakable evidences that they are not and can not become useful American citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask an extension.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope the gentleman will be granted unanimous consent to continue his remarks for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, who will point out in this measure a single section, a single line, a single syllable that aims at more than mere police and sanitary regulations? Is there a just demand for nothing more? Is there necessity for nothing more than this?

I believe the time is coming when, notwithstanding the danger of being subjected to the criticism of demagogues who will seek to array the worthy elements of our foreign-born population against those who undertake to stand in the pathway of this evil, the time is coming when we must face the responsibility, when the American Congress must see to it that classes who in the very nature of things can not be Americanized shall be prohibited from taking up their domicile in the United States.

And in this connection another question arises. Our present naturalization laws were passed at a time when our immigration consisted of the very cream of the population of Europe. The large immigration between 1848 and 1860 was caused by political complications abroad. The great revolutionary movement of 1848 had provoked disquietude through all Europe, and had caused the general migration from the Germanic States of men who came here because they desired to live in a republic. They came here because they were republicans and sought the blessings of republican institutions. In those days those who came to our shores were compelled to make great sacrifices. If they were poor, it required years of economy to accumulate the necessary funds. Only the fittest came. Since that time the sources of European immigration have changed entirely. The immigration from Germany absolutely fell off between 1899 and 1900, while the immigration from other countries, of people who are confessedly less desirable as citizens, increased enormously.

The question which, sooner or later, must be answered by the American Congress is whether we are going to close the doors against the brutalized classes of alien laborers which until recently was almost unknown but which now form a large part of the annual addition to our population. I believe there is no civilized country on earth that has not within its borders persons who would be desirable as citizens of this country. Let them come. I think thousands are coming here every year whose presence will work injury to the welfare of the country. Bar them out. The question raised may be difficult, but if the Congress had done its duty long ago it would have been made utterly impossible for a shipload of laborers to come here from a European country, nine-tenths of them leaving their families behind them, not one in ten intending to settle in the country, and who, having worked one, two, or three years at the most, take their savings and return to their homes in the old country.

If this is to continue, the level of the wages and the standard of living of the laborer will continue to fall until finally under "the iron law" of wages, which allots to the laborer only the wage necessary to maintain him in such condition that he can continue to work and propagate his species, the American laborers as a class will sink to the level of their alien competitors—the level of European pauperism.

The question is whether the American citizen, native or naturalized, whether born here or in Germany, Holland, France,

Sweden, Norway, or Switzerland, is to be submitted to unlimited competition with the most debased classes of the Old World? Shall this unlimited competition against the pauperized classes of the Old World fix the standard of living, and thereby the standard of respectability of the American laborer? Shall we continue to permit alien laborers to leave their families behind, come here as mere sojourners, live and labor under conditions repulsive to all our ideas, hundreds occupying a single building, sleeping in bunks ranged on the wall much as the shelves in a store, and subsisting at nominal expense—are we to permit them to drag down the standard of living and the standard of self-respect hitherto prevailing among American wage-earners? If so, farewell to every hope and aspiration which labor has a right to indulge.

As a police measure this bill improves existing laws and I favor its passage. It does not even aim to prevent the immigration of able-bodied pauper laborers. Therefore it does not meet the necessities of the situation as they appear to the wage-earners of the country.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Immigration if he will accept this amendment: In line 7, after the words "foreign port," insert these words, "other than those on the Great Lakes," so that it will read "who shall come by steam, sail, or other vessel from any foreign port other than those on the Great Lakes to any port within the United States."

Mr. Chairman, at Niagara Falls visitors come in by rail across bridges; at Detroit they cross in ferry boats as well as on the cars, hundreds of travelers, not immigrants, who wish to visit and travel in our country. Under this bill they must pay a dollar and a half for the privilege of being in the country perhaps for an hour or two.

There is a line of boats running from Toronto to Wolcott on Lake Ontario, which is just below Lockport; also a line running from Toronto to Charlotte, 6 or 7 miles from Rochester, and a line of boats running from Toronto to Lewiston, at the mouth of the Niagara River, and during the summer these boats are filled with travelers from England, Germany, France, and other countries, passengers who land in Canada and want to visit Niagara Falls. They come, also, by way of the St. Lawrence from Quebec and Montreal for the purpose of visiting that historic and picturesque spot. Now, it seems absurd that these passengers, travelers, pleasure seekers for the moment, should be compelled to pay a dollar and a half each simply for landing in the country for two or three days to visit Niagara Falls and the other places of interest in that vicinity.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I will state to the gentleman that the amendment makes it apply equally to railroads as it does to steamboats.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It has not been accepted yet.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. No; that is what we are discussing, that amendment making it apply to every passenger who crosses by rail, as well as boat, to your city or any other.

Mr. RUCKER. Does the gentleman understand that this language does not apply to any citizen of Canada?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Certainly; but there are hundreds of English people, Scotch people, and other foreigners, who visit Canada in the summer, who go over to Niagara Falls and other places of interest on this side for a day or two, and the word "passenger" would compel them to pay a dollar and a half for the privilege of crossing from Clifton to Niagara Falls, just to spend an hour or two.

Mr. SHATTUC. If it were my own money that was at stake, and the gentleman asked for this contribution to his people, I would give it, but the United States Government needs this money.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, no; it does not.

Mr. SHATTUC. Besides this, the administration of this law will be in the hands of our Secretary of the Treasury, and he will not make rules that will be obnoxious at all.

Mr. HILL. Oh, well, let us have it a matter of law.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What would the gentleman from Ohio say if the English Parliament should assess every American coming across the Channel to Dover a dollar and a half additional to his fare, simply for the privilege of visiting England?

Mr. SHATTUC. I should say they were a very enterprising set of people. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Business people.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I move this amendment in line 7, after the words "foreign people," to insert the words "other than those on the Great Lakes," so that, with the other pending amendment, all visitors entering this country from Canada, other than citizens of Canada, may come without the payment of a dollar and a half, whether they come by rail or by boat.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Maine who have referred to

amendments that they wish to offer, that the chairman of the committee [Mr. SHATTUC] has furnished the series of amendments which he desires to offer, and it will be in order first to pass upon the amendments submitted by the chairman, in order to avoid confusion. These amendments having been passed upon, the section can then be perfected by disposing of other amendments. Debate on this amendment is now exhausted, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I call for the reading of the amendment that we are voting on.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1, page 1, line 8, by inserting after the word "States" a comma instead of a period, and by inserting after the word "States" the following: "or by any railway or any other mode of transportation from foreign contiguous territory to the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 12, amend by striking out after the word "vessel" the words "or by the alien passenger, if such alien passenger comes overland, within twenty-four hours after the arrival of such vessel in port, or by such overland alien passenger upon application for admission" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or transportation line;" in line 25, page 2, after the word "immigration," insert the words "under the direction or;" so that it will read:

"That there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of \$1.50 for each and every passenger not a citizen of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada or of the Republic of Mexico who shall come by steam, sail, or other vessel from any foreign port to any port within the United States, or by any railway or other mode of transportation from foreign contiguous territory to the United States. The said duty shall be paid to the collector of customs of the port or customs district to which said alien passenger shall come, or, if there be no collector at such port or district, then to the collector nearest thereto, by the master, agent, owner, or consignee of every such vessel or transportation line: * * * Provided, That the Commissioner-General of Immigration, under the direction or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, etc."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. All the amendments submitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] have now been agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I have sent up an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7, page 1, after the words "foreign ports," insert "others than those on the Great Lakes."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHATTUC. I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the section as amended by inserting immediately after the words "United States," in line 8, the words "upon every alien immigrant coming," and to strike out the word "or."

I would state, Mr. Chairman, the effect of that amendment if adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that all debate on this section and amendments has been closed.

Mr. PERKINS. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. After a motion to close debate has been agreed to, debate on the motion to strike out the last word is not in order.

Mr. PERKINS. I merely desire to explain the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the committee has determined that no debate shall be in order upon this section.

Mr. CANNON. Unanimous consent can always be given.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to be permitted to explain the amendment.

Mr. SHATTUC. What is it that the gentleman wants to explain?

Mr. PERKINS. I merely want to explain it, not to say one word in the way of argument.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should be adopted the result is this: The bill imposes upon every passenger that lands on the seaboard \$1.50. This is not changed by the amendment. The operation of the law, which is the present law, remains. The provision of new law, which has been offered by the committee, is to impose a tax of \$1.50 on every passenger who comes into this country from Mexico and Canada by rail. I think it is an unfair provision to impose that tax upon every "passenger," and the amendment is that the tax shall be imposed on every "immigrant" who comes by rail from Canada or Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SHATTUC. I simply desire to say that the amendment ought not to pass.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I have an amendment to offer.

After the word "Canada," in line 5, insert the following: "the Republic of Cuba."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Division.

Mr. LESSLER. What is it all about?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. To give the Republic of Cuba the same rights that we grant to Canada and Mexico, it being the only other country on this continent that we want to give it to.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 50, yeas 22.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next section.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, insane persons, epileptics, and persons who have been insane within five years previous; persons who have had two or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; paupers; persons likely to become a public charge; persons afflicted with a loathsome or with a dangerous contagious disease; persons who have been convicted of a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of all government or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials; prostitutes, and persons who procure or attempt to bring in prostitutes or women for the purpose of prostitution; persons whose migration to the United States has been induced by offers, solicitations, promises, or agreements, parole or special, express or implied, of labor or work, or service of any kind in the United States; and also any person whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes; but this section shall not be held to prevent persons living in the United States from sending for a relative or friend who is not of the foregoing excluded classes: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude persons convicted of an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude: *And provided further*, That skilled labor may be imported, if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country; and the provisions of this section shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does not the chairman of the committee take precedence?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Alabama will withhold his amendment, the chairman of the committee has an amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for recognition when the committee is through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers the following amendment on behalf of the committee, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 2, page 3, line 23, strike out the semicolon after the word "States" and insert a comma in lieu thereof, and insert "and those who have been, within one year from the date of application for admission to the United States, deported as being under offers, solicitations, or promises or agreement to perform labor or service of some kind therein."

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama submits an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill by adding as a new section, between lines 14 and 15, on page 4, the following:

"SEC. 3. That in addition to the persons excluded under the foregoing section, admission into the United States shall be denied to all persons over 15 years of age and physically capable of reading who can not read the English language or some other language; but an admissible immigrant or a person now in or hereafter admitted to this country may bring in or send for his wife, his children under 18 years of age, and his parents or grandparents over 50 years of age, if they are otherwise admissible, whether they are so able to read or not."

"That for the purpose of testing the ability of the immigrant to read the inspection officers shall be furnished with copies of the Constitution of the United States, printed on uniform pasteboard slips, each containing not less than 20 nor more than 25 words of said Constitution printed in the various languages of the immigrants in double small pica type. Each immigrant may designate the language in which he prefers the test shall be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on a slip in such language. No two immigrants listed on the same manifest shall be tested with the same slip. An immigrant failing to read as above provided shall not be admitted, but shall be returned to the country from which he came at the expense of the steamship or railroad company which brought him."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday in general debate I made—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to say to the gentleman from Alabama and the committee that other gentlemen of the committee desire to offer amendments to section 2, and without objection those amendments will be considered before this.

Mr. SHATTUC. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio what is his point of order?

Mr. SHATTUC. I consider that it is not germane.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman makes the point of order that it is not germane. All I have to say is, that this is a bill for the restriction of immigration. The amendment offered restricts immigration, and I think it must be clearly germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama that he is informed that there are other amendments to section 2. Section 2 ought to be perfected before it is passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, no gentleman claimed the floor, and therefore I offered my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from California has an amendment to present to section 2.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the floor with the amendment pending, Mr. Chairman, until section 2 is perfected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as pending as a new section while section 2 is being perfected.

The gentleman from California [Mr. COOMBS] sends up an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out on page 4, line 7, all after the word "turpitude" and all of lines 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the amendment read. I could not hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is this amendment offered by the gentleman from California an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California is an amendment to perfect section 2. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is a new section to the bill.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And not an amendment to section 2?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been twice reported; but without objection, it will be again read.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Chairman, I think that section 2 is intended to comprehend completely the classes of people who are to be excluded from coming into this country under this bill. The language which this amendment seeks to strike out, if left in, is such a qualification of the exclusion which is intended by the section, as, in my mind, to entirely invalidate and vitiate it.

Section 2 provides that idiots, insane persons, epileptics, paupers and those who may become a public charge, those infected with loathsome and contagious diseases, convicted of a felony or other crime not involving moral turpitude, polygamists, anarchists, prostitutes, etc., shall be excluded from coming into the United States. Now, on page 4, it is provided, as an exception to that rule, that those who may be professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants, are excepted, although they may be within the class prohibited. That is a fair construction of it, although, of course, it is not intended so by the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. It does not read that way.

Mr. COOMBS. An anarchist, if he is an artist, may be admitted. Learned professors may come in although they might be preachers of the doctrine of anarchy in their own country.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. COOMBS. Very well.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If a man comes into the country as an artist and he was found to be an anarchist at some time, under the provisions of this section he would be admitted as an artist but excluded as an anarchist, because there is a specific section in the bill which excludes anarchists.

Mr. COOMBS. That is the point of it; it would admit him as an artist, but it could not exclude him as an anarchist. He has a peculiar exemption under the provisions of this bill; and, though he is an artist, although he has all of the traits of character inhibited in the first provisions of the bill, yet being an artist, he has a right to come in. It is my opinion that this exception should be

provided for in some other portion of the bill. I think the bill is faulty in that respect.

There is another part which I think must be stricken out.

Mr. GROW. Suppose it read "anarchists in any profession or business should be excluded."

Mr. COOMBS. That might perhaps be sufficient, I do not know. In lines 7 and 8 of this bill, on page 4, it is provided that skilled labor may be imported if the labor of a like kind not employed can not be found in this country.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that at one time that may have been a necessary part of the material progress of this nation, when industries were in their infancy, when in the formative condition, it might have been material to our progress to bring men in here skilled in a particular line. That time has gone by. I see no occasion now, under our present system, of continuing in force a provision the reason for which has gone by and has become obsolete.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. COOMBS. Certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I desire to ask the gentleman from California if his attention has ever been called to the manufacture of lenses used in large telescopes. In Buffalo we have a manufactory of that kind, the only one, I think, in the United States.

Our people have found it absolutely necessary to go to Germany to find skilled workmen who can grind those lenses. This is an infant industry; it is a growing industry; it is a most important industry; and if the Secretary of the Treasury had not found some way of allowing skilled laborers in that line of work to come in under existing laws, the factory to which I refer would have been seriously crippled.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ADAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] a question. Is he on this committee?

Mr. ADAMS. I have that honor.

Mr. CLARK. Then I want to ask him about two lines in section 2—lines 8 and 9 on page 4, which are printed in italics:

If labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country.

Now, will not that provision open the flood gates to the importation into this country of all kinds of contract labor?

Mr. ADAMS. I think not, because if there should be skilled labor unemployed in the country, capable of doing the work in question, the skilled labor from abroad could not be imported. On the other hand, if there is no unemployed labor suitable for that class of work, then we need these skilled laborers from abroad.

Mr. CLARK. Now, let me ask the gentleman another question. Who is to determine whether there is in this country unemployed skilled labor of the kind which it is proposed to bring in under contract?

Mr. ADAMS. The facts of the case would be submitted to the officers of the United States, and it would be for them to determine the operation of this provision, as in the case of other provisions with respect to immigrants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was about to reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. COOMBS]. I am afraid that gentleman's mind has been in such a state of excitement and tension regarding the Chinese-exclusion bill during the present session that he is unduly apprehensive in regard to any legislation which may undertake to regulate immigration in this country. I think he has stretched the language of this section of the bill in a way which unduly arouses his apprehensions, and might lead to misjudgment on the part of other gentlemen, unless proper explanation be made. The gentleman certainly does not wish to stop the development of our country in the arts or sciences or manufactures by preventing the importation of skilled laborers, when there is a stringent provision that such importation shall not take place unless we need such labor, and unless there is in this country no such labor unemployed.

Mr. COOMBS. Is it proposed in this bill that the importation of skilled laborers shall be regulated by the Secretary of the Treasury—that he shall determine in what cases such importation is proper?

Mr. ADAMS. This whole bill will be put into execution under regulations laid down by the Secretary of the Treasury for its enforcement.

Mr. COOMBS. If that is the case, then of course I should not be insistent with regard to that particular part of my amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Then I will proceed to answer the other part of the gentleman's argument.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], I would like to state an instance that came within my knowledge where skilled mechanics were required in certain knitting mills, and no laborers of the necessary kind could be found unemployed in this country.

Mechanics who were being brought in to meet that necessity were held up in the city of New York, but upon the presentation of the case to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Immigration and showing the facts those laborers were admitted to the country for that special and infant industry.

Mr. ADAMS. I could mention half a dozen of such industries. For instance, the silk industry, or the designing of patterns for cotton prints, etc. There are innumerable cases in which it may be necessary to import skilled labor to aid us in carrying on infant industries. I need not say to my friend from California that the genius of the American people is such that they are constantly creating new industries that demand development, and these new industries are entitled to the same protection that has been accorded to similar industries under similar circumstances in the past.

On one other point I would like to relieve the apprehension of the gentleman. He supposes that there may apply for admission as an immigrant some one who is a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde—who is, we will suppose, an anarchist on one side and a play actor on the other. But in such a case, if there should be found on any side of the man's character any unfitness for his entrance into this country, he may be excluded.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that this bill provides in section 2 that no person "convicted of a felony" shall be admitted. Now, I wish to ask whether there is any provision of the existing law or any proposed provision in this bill which will be effective in excluding persons of that class?

Mr. ADAMS. The provision of the law or of this bill on that subject will be just as effective as any law can be.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does this bill amend the existing law in that respect? Does it make the present remedy applicable in such a case any more effective?

Mr. ADAMS. I think not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, will the gentleman permit me to state briefly an incident that came under my notice showing the necessity for the amendment of the existing law in order to secure the exclusion of ex-convicts?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If it is simply proposed to leave the law as it is now, I think this incident will show the absolute necessity for some sort of remedy. I was in Chicago to see a friend, a lawyer, and was told that he was at the criminal court. I went there and he was engaged in the trial of a murder case. The defendant, Frank Mulkowski, was on the stand, a very intelligent appearing man about 40 years of age. He was convicted and hanged for murder. He had been in this country six months, had gone to his boarding house and murdered the wife of the man with whom he boarded, robbed her of her jewelry, rings, and a little watch or something of that kind. He had come straight from Europe, straight from a penitentiary after having served twenty years of a life sentence for a murder committed there when he was 19 years of age. So that the law to-day, if not to be amended by this bill, permits ex-convicts, ex-murderers to be pardoned in Europe and have free access to this country.

Mr. BARTHOLOMT. But it does not permit it.

Mr. ADAMS. I will call the attention of the gentleman to the provision contained in line 13, page 3, which excludes "persons who have been convicted of a felony or other crime."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But it does not exclude them. You say they shall not be admitted, but they are admitted. Why was not that man kept out?

Mr. ADAMS. Of course you can not enforce a law anywhere unless you know that its provisions have been broken.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is no provision of the law by which you can determine whether the man has been an ex-convict. Why is not some provision made requiring the man to bring a certificate from the mayor or some other officer of the town in which he resides that he is a person of good moral character before he is permitted to get on the ship, and not permit a man to come direct from the doors of a penitentiary, as Frank Mulkowski did, in Chicago, and commit murder six months after he comes here?

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman may not be aware of the fact, but we have agents in Europe who are supposed to look into the records of these people who do come.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit me to call his attention to section 13 of this bill? The section provides generally for a list or manifest to be made out by the master of the vessel, showing the character of the person whom he is shipping over here, and it says that list or manifest shall be verified "by the signature and the oath or affirmation of the master or commanding officer or the first or second below him in command, taken before an immigration officer at the port of arrival, to the effect that he has caused the surgeon of

said vessel sailing therewith to make a physical and oral examination of each of said aliens, and that from the report of said surgeon and from his own investigation he believes that no one of said aliens is an idiot, or insane person, or a pauper, or is likely to become a public charge, or is suffering from a loathsome or a dangerous contagious disease, or is a person who has been convicted of a felony or other crime or misdemeanor." etc.

That is the only provision in this bill to exclude ex-convicts from our shores, that the captain of the ship, interested in getting all the money he can from the people whom he brings over here, sends the surgeon of his own ship down to examine the people and see whether they have loathsome diseases, and on the report of that physician this officer makes oath that he thinks the man has never been convicted of a felony. It is a perfect farce on the face of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say as a matter of practice, because the law stands to-day as proposed by this bill, that the Treasury Department has what you might call detectives in Europe whose sole business is to look into the moral character of emigrants who may come out, and they keep track of the criminals and try to stop them. It would be impossible for this Government to have a recognized officer in Europe, under international law, to hunt these people up or to look into their records any more than in general, and as for demanding a certificate from the mayor or other officer of the place from which the emigrant comes, I think that would be a very stringent provision and would be casting a slur on every honest emigrant that comes to this country—that he must bring a certificate of character. It is not required.

Mr. COOMBS. May I interrupt the gentleman a minute, just to say that since the consideration of this proposed amendment the members of the committee sitting here have agreed upon an amendment which, I think, will meet my ideas and cure the objections I have urged. If it is agreeable to the committee, I should like to withdraw my amendment, in order that they may introduce theirs.

Mr. ADAMS. Being a member of the committee, I shall be very glad to acquiesce in the action of the committee.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will my friend from Pennsylvania permit me a moment?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. COOMBS. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to withdraw his proposed amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER rose and was recognized.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that time has been yielded to me by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania can not yield time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. ADAMS. I had five minutes allowed to me, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that under the five-minute rule he can not yield his time.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], a member of the committee, was to have been recognized next.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have framed an amendment which will meet all of the objections that have been urged to this section thus far. I will send it to the Clerk's desk and let the Clerk read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all between "country," in line 9, to the word "shall," in line 10, and insert the following: "And provided further, That the provisions of law applicable to contract labor."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri submits this amendment to be read in his remarks?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes. Now, Mr. Chairman, the qualifying clause of this proviso had reference to the contract-labor feature of this section, and with this amendment I think it is unobjectionable.

Mr. CLARK. How will that make it read?

Mr. RUCKER. It will make it read as follows:

And provided further, That skilled labor may be imported, if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country: And provided further,

That the provisions of this law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants.

It makes them amenable to all the other provisions of this law, excluding objectionable classes, but admits professional men and those engaged in skilled trades, ministers of the gospel, etc., even though they are under contract. Ministers of the gospel, as I understand, are sometimes contracted with and brought here to take charge of churches. Under the legal construction of the contract-labor law they are contracted with, and therefore can not come. A theatrical troupe or company can not be brought here under contract for the same reason; but with this provision, exempting them from the operations of the contract feature of the law, it still leaves them amenable to all other provisions, and if they are afflicted with a contagious disease or if they are anarchists or in any other way objectionable to this law or come within any of the other excluded classes, then they could not come at all.

Mr. RAY of New York. If the gentleman will permit, I simply desire to call his attention to the fact that the words "and provided further" are equivalent to the word "except," and therefore, under section 2 as it stands, and under the language that you have inserted, under the pretense that a man's labor was skilled labor and that labor of a like kind unemployed can not be found in this country, or that he was an actor, or an artist, or a lecturer, or a singer, or a minister of the gospel, or a professor of a college, he would have to be admitted, even if an anarchist, a felon, diseased, insane, etc. In other words, such a person would not be within the meaning of the law or the provisions of section 2, even if he had all the diseases and defects—physical, mental, and moral—that you have described in the section because the exception is absolute and would not be excluded; and while I do not care to interfere with the bill in any way, I simply call attention to it, because you nullify the real purpose of the entire section by putting in those words and exceptions in the form the section now assumes. These exceptions are made by treaties, generally, and such persons should be admitted if not diseased, or if sound mentally and morally, etc.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I can not accept the interpretation and the definition of the gentleman from New York, even if the provision of the contract-labor law shall not be held to include these gentlemen.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, why not remove any objection or any question about it by adding an amendment at the end of that section. You provide that skilled labor shall come in. You provide that it shall not exclude actors, etc. Why not add at the end of the section, "if not within the other prohibited classes hereinbefore mentioned."

Mr. RUCKER. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. RAY of New York. Then say so.

Mr. RUCKER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. RAY of New York. Then I ask to add at the end of the section "if not within the other prohibited classes hereinbefore mentioned."

Mr. MANN. Is not one of the prohibited classes those who are under contract?

Mr. RAY of New York. Not in that section.

Mr. MANN. It is all in the same section.

Mr. RAY of New York. I would say, then, that perhaps that ought to be looked to a little more closely, and we can return to it hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHATTUC. I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOMBS. May I interrupt the gentleman? I would make this suggestion. When the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is accepted, and then the amendment of the gentleman from New York is accepted, it will cure it entirely. One should precede in its acceptance and the other should follow.

Mr. RUCKER. I would like to have the amendment read again.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WACHTER. I would like to have the amendment reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks that the amendment be reported. Without objection the Clerk will report the amendment. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that the Clerk is unable to make the amendment coincide with the language of the bill. Will the gentleman

from Missouri kindly follow the reading of the amendment by the Clerk?

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all after "country," in line 9, to the word "shall," in line 10, and insert the following:

Mr. RUCKER. Wait a minute, Mr. Clerk. That is on page 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all after "country," in line 9, to the word "shall," in line 10.

Mr. RUCKER. That ought to be amended so as to read between the word "country," in line 9, and the word "shall," in line 10.

The CLERK. To and including the word "shall?"

Mr. RUCKER. To the word "shall." Between "country" and "shall."

The Clerk read as follows:

And insert the following: *Provided further*, "That the provision of law applicable to contract labor," so that it will read: "And provided further, That the provisions of law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to include professional actors," etc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the amendment.

There was no objection.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless there are further amendments to section 2—

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, I understood the amendment I suggested was to be accepted, to add at the end of the section, "Provided such persons are not within the other prohibited classes herein before specified."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York offer his amendment?

Mr. RAY of New York. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, which the Clerk will report:

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the section: "Provided, That such persons are not within the other prohibited classes hereinbefore specified."

Mr. CURRIER. Are not contract laborers in the prohibited classes?

Mr. RAY of New York. You say "that skilled labor may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country." Now, you say that the provisions of this section shall not be held to exclude "professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of religious denominations, professors of colleges, or persons belonging to any learned profession or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants," and then the amendment added to that would be "if not within the other prohibited classes hereinbefore specified."

Mr. CURRIER. But contract labor would be within the prohibited class.

Mr. MANN. In the beginning of the section are the words "that the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States."

Mr. RAY of New York. That is right.

Mr. MANN. One of those classes is composed of persons whose immigration into the United States has been induced by "offers, solicitations, promises, or agreements, etc., to labor and work," so that we could have this one prohibited class. Now, probably the court would construe your amendment only applied to the other prohibited class, because this is one of the classes in this section.

Mr. McCALL. The gentlemen can frame it so as not to make such a strain on the semicolon. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may go on with the bill and return to this paragraph at a future time, and I will put my amendment in such shape as to be unobjectionable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when this paragraph is perfected it may be passed without prejudice as far as returning to it is concerned.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment that I wish to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding, after the word "classes," in line 2, page 4, the following: "Provided, That all persons immigrating to the United States above the age of 16 years shall produce a certificate of good character from the local municipal authority of the country in which they last resided, or of some official representing the United States in such country."

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was considered, and the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am in order at this time, but I would like to offer an amendment to

this bill which appears to me to be of great importance. It would take the place, in my judgment, of what is going to be proposed by some gentleman on the other side as an amendment, called the educational test. My amendment will much more effectually exclude undesirable immigrants.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood from the Chair that as I yielded for amendments to the section I was to be recognized when it came to an amendment for a new section. If the gentleman from Missouri rises to offer a new provision, I think I should have precedence.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is correct in his statement. The Chair was listening to hear the full statement of the gentleman from Missouri to be sure that the Chair was right. No amendments are in order except the amendments to perfect section 2.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Very well, Mr. Chairman; I am willing to withhold my amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, it has been an hour or more since my amendment was read, and I would like to have it again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill by adding as a new section, between lines 14 and 15 on page 4, the following:

"Sec. 3. That in addition to the persons excluded under the foregoing section, admission into the United States shall be denied to all persons over 15 years of age and physically capable of reading who can not read the English language or some other language; but an admissible immigrant or a person now in or hereafter admitted to this country may bring in or send for his wife, his children under 18 years of age, and his parents or grandparents over 50 years of age, if they are otherwise admissible, whether they are so able to read or not."

That for the purpose of testing the ability of the immigrant to read the inspection officers shall be furnished with copies of the Constitution of the United States, printed on uniform pasteboard slips, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 25 words of said Constitution printed in the various languages of the immigrants in double small pica type. Each immigrant may designate the language in which he prefers the test shall be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on a slip in such language. No two immigrants listed on the same manifest shall be tested with the same slip. An immigrant failing to read as above provided shall not be admitted, but shall be returned to the country from which he came at the expense of the steamship or railroad company which brought him."

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I understood this was offered as a new section—as section 14.

The CHAIRMAN. No; section 3.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is offered as a new section between lines 14 and 15 on page 4.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, and I will not take up the time of the committee to discuss it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is so purely germane that I will not occupy the time of the committee, and I ask for a ruling by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out in passing on this question that an examination of this bill shows that it is a general immigration measure, the title being "to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States." Section 35 repeals all other laws inconsistent with this law. Any amendment to this bill, in the opinion of the Chair, which is clearly and distinctly connected logically with the general scope and intent of the bill would be germane.

Section 2 provides restrictions upon which aliens shall enter this country; it limits the number of aliens by classes who may enter this country. This amendment provides for a new section, adds a new restriction, an additional restriction, to the class of persons who may enter under our immigration laws.

It is not the province of the Chair to pass on the merits or demerits of any amendment, or its wisdom or justice. It appears to the Chair that this amendment is clearly, distinctly, and logically connected with the general scope of a bill regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States, and under these circumstances the Chair feels constrained to overrule the point of order and hold that the amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I explained to the House what this amendment was. There may be some members here this morning that were not present yesterday afternoon, and I merely desire to occupy the time of the committee for a very few moments, to state what is the object and purpose of this amendment.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the gentleman's attention—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Tennessee will wait until I have finished, I will answer his question. There is

an impression in some portions of the United States and with a large number of people that there are some restrictions on immigration to this country other than paupers, criminals, and persons unhealthy and blind and disabled, but as a matter of fact there are none. Now, this provision merely is intended to provide for an educational test as to the admission of immigrants into the United States.

It is a very liberal test, it is a very fair test, and it is not harsh or restrictive in any particular. It merely provides that the man who is coming to this country to become a citizen of the United States, to have a voice in the management of our Government, and to exercise the right of governing us as well as himself, shall be able to read the Constitution of the United States when he enters our country for that purpose, either in the English language or in his own language.

It further allows that man to bring with him his children who are under the age of 18 years, whether they can read and write or not, and allows him to bring with him his parents and grandparents, whether they can read or write or not, if they are over 50 years of age, thereby providing that families shall not be separated, allowing the whole family to come here together.

Now, why should we adopt such an amendment? It is certainly liberal; it is certainly reasonable so far as it goes. Why should we say that an educational test shall be established instead of adopting some other method? Simply because the educational test comes nearer to accomplishing what we want to do with as little risk, as little expense to the Government of the United States as any other method that can be devised.

I recognize, as I said yesterday, that the educational test is not always a test of intelligence; but what we want to do is to encourage immigration to this country from northern Europe. We want the Swedes, the Norwegians, the Frenchmen, the German, the Irishmen, the Englishmen, the Scotchmen, and persons from intelligent Europe to come here. We want to keep our lands open for them. Now, sir, the statistics show that of the people coming from that portion of the world as immigrants to this country only about 5 per cent can not read, 95 per cent can. Therefore, of the select class of immigrants that we want, we shall, if this amendment be adopted, get 95 per cent and shall only reject 5 per cent. On the other hand, of the class of immigrants that we do not want—the people from southern Italy—43 per cent of those can not read or write, as the statistics show; but really the percentage is greater, because these statistics have been gathered by simply taking the word of the immigrants when they come here, without making any actual test.

We have simply taken their own statements. Therefore if we are right in wanting to exclude that class from admission into the United States, then by the adoption of this amendment we exclude 43 per cent of this undesirable class and only 5 per cent of the desirable class of immigrants. This test is to be made at the port when they arrive here; but the steamship company that gathers them up and brings them here—the steamship company and their agents—will apply the test before they leave the country on the other side, because under the provisions of this amendment if the immigrant can not comply with the test the steamship company must return him to the land whence he came. Therefore very few who can not comply with the test will come here and need be returned.

Now, why should we adopt the amendment? I say it is as much our duty to protect our country against undesirable immigrants from Europe as it is to protect the children in our homes from undesirable society.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the reasons which I gave yesterday to show that this amendment should not be adopted—that it would tend to exclude a desirable class of immigrants, men who would do the drudgery that this country requires and which possibly the American laborer refuses to perform—in addition to that reason as showing that it would be unwise and impolitic to adopt the amendment, I wish to state this additional reason: That it will not only exclude people who can not read or write, but will have the effect of frightening away from our shores the desirable class of immigration described by my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. He admits that under his amendment it will be necessary that the test be applied on the American shore.

Now, if this threat be held out to the German immigrants (to whom it seems bouquets have been thrown by various speakers), I predict that very few Germans, unless they are professors or scientific men, will be willing to undergo an examination on this side of the Atlantic upon a technical document like the Constitution, whether it is to be read in one language or another. Such people—people who come over here to earn an honest living and who are conceded to be a desirable addition to our citizenship—will ponder a long time before they will make a long journey across the ocean in order to submit themselves to an examination

by some "smart Aleck" of an inspector who may refuse them admission because they have not read with the proper emphasis or with the proper observance of punctuation a technical document like the Constitution of the United States. I warn gentlemen on the other side of the House as well as on this that if they are going to insert any drastic restrictions like this in the present bill, they may just as well put in the bill the declaration "We do not want any immigration of any class."

I agree perfectly with the ruling of the Chair; I have no complaint to make on that score. But I hope that unless this amendment be properly amended—and I do not see how it can be amended, because I believe the nature of the provision is such as to place it beyond the power of surgery—it may be voted down, because when you make that kind of a threat and say that people before they can emigrate to this country must submit to a kind of teacher's examination upon the shores of the United States, you will have very few to emigrate to this country, and we shall see the stream of hardy immigrants who have been coming to our shores for all these years turned toward South America or some other country where they will not be pestered with such drastic restrictions as these.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] which provides that no person shall hereafter come into this country who is unable to read and write the Constitution of the United States is a most dangerous and selfish proposition. I am opposed to it, and I am opposed to the bill with that proposition in it. I am surprised that it should be offered by one of the leading Democrats of this House, and apparently favored by nearly all of the Democrats. Slurs have been cast by some gentlemen against the immigration to our country from southern Europe. The Italian, Polish, and Bohemian immigrants have been harshly denounced. I rise again to say a word in their favor.

I assert that they do not make bad citizens. I say, on the contrary, that they make good citizens. Most of them are hard working and economical. They come to this land partly for greater liberty and partly because they can do better here. They leave home and friends and family on the other side of the ocean, and, enduring all sorts of hardships, they come here because of the hope that their children may enjoy greater comforts and a better education than they or their fathers were permitted to enjoy. I do not care whether they can read or write when they come here or not. The love of liberty is not confined to those who can read and write. The love of children is not denied to those who can neither read nor write. Reading and writing do not determine intelligence. These immigrants coming here to us have learned how to do their work and do it well. That is sometimes better than knowing how to read and write. In my opinion it would be better to keep out the mechanic who can read and write and who comes here in competition with the mechanic in our country rather than to keep out the laborer who, after he arrives here, will consume with his family his share of the products produced by others.

I am not in favor of a narrow-minded, selfish, stingy view of immigration.

Mr. Chairman, I understand very well that there is quite a prevailing impression upon the part of the people of our country of American descent who have not come in contact with the foreign-born population or their children that the foreign-born population, or a very large proportion of it coming here—possible ignorant so far as reading and writing are concerned—is a menace to the future of our country. Now, I happen to represent from the city of Chicago what would be known there as a silk-stock district, but I deny all of those charges concerning the foreign-born population and their descendants, and I say without hesitation that an observation of some years in our city, largely composed of foreign-born population, and more than half composed of people foreign born and their children, has convinced me that the children of these people coming here from other countries, attending the public schools, taking an interest, as they do, in public affairs, make just as good citizens as those whose ancestors came over in the *Mayflower*.

Observation everywhere in these large cities, where you come in practical daily contact and experience with the descendants of the foreign-born population, is to the effect that they take a greater interest in public affairs, oftentimes, than the Americans themselves; that they give as great attention to every question of public policy; that they become the very best of citizens, the children almost invariably attending public schools. I heard the gentleman here yesterday read an editorial from the Post of this city, purporting to quote a statement by some gentleman from the Austrian Parliament. That statement, if ever made, was untrue. You go into the city of New York and you will find with their books under their arms, going to school, the descendants of the children of the foreign-born population in larger proportion than you will find in the purely American neighborhoods.

Our American people have gotten to the point in many places where the wealthy think it is unwise to send their children to the public schools, but the foreign-born citizen sends his children to the public school, where they come in contact with all classes and where they are prepared to become good public-spirited citizens. The city of Chicago is composed largely of the foreign-born people. We have a population of the Polish larger than any other city in the country; we have a population in many of the nationalities larger than the cities in the countries from which they came. They are among the best citizens we have in the city of Chicago. It is true that to a certain extent they yield a preference to their own nationality, but I have yet to see a native of a foreign country who is more clannish than the native of America itself.

There is less cry on their part of nationality than there is on the part of the American citizens. Oh, yes, perhaps they may have been ignorant when they came. Their children are not ignorant after they have been raised here and sent to the public schools, and the first generation makes good citizens, the second generation makes better citizens, and there is no occasion for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], whom I highly respect, to offer the proposition that he has. I have a few Polish people in my district, and the only evidence of ignorance that I find on their part is that almost without exception they vote the Democratic ticket [laughter], but I have belief and hope that as their children go to the public schools and become educated, as they will, that they will become wise enough to abandon not merely the leadership of my friend upon this proposition but upon the other heresies of government which he constantly advocates. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, when the amendment was being discussed imposing a tax of a dollar and a half upon people coming into this country from Canada and Mexico and other countries, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] said that an amendment materially affecting that amendment—

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. We are not discussing that question of a dollar and a half.

Mr. McCALL. If the gentleman will have patience I will, in my own way, get to a discussion of the question. It was said that it would have an adverse effect upon the bill to change it in that particular. Now, that proposition to impose a tax of a dollar and a half upon immigrants would have no more effect in restricting immigration to this country than a mere cobweb; it would keep out nobody whom it was not desired to have here.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], which is now pending, is an amendment that will restrict. It will shut out a great number of immigrants. I am not opposed to those people to whom this amendment would apply—I am not hostile to them, but I believe it would be wise for us to pass some measure that would have the effect of restricting to a certain extent immigration to this country. Some six years ago I offered a bill in substance in the form of this amendment. It was considered by the Committee on Immigration; it was exhaustively debated in the House of Representatives; it came to a vote, and it passed this House by 195 to 26.

At that time we had been having hard times in this country. There was a great industrial depression. The labor market was overstocked, and the cry of labor to Congress was for some measure that would give relief. We are not in that condition to-day; but I want to call the attention of this committee to this consideration: We protect the products of labor; our great corporations that are engaged in manufacturing have their products protected; but the labor, that which is the chief element in that production, they get free of duty; and they are entirely willing, while their product is protected, that they be permitted to bring into this country almost unlimited numbers of laborers to diminish the cost of production.

Now, I fear we shall at some time in the future see industrial depression again. We shall have overproduction; we are going to have hard times, and then we shall have the same cry of labor again. I submit that the time for us to treat this subject is now, so that we may not have a menace to our labor; so that our laborers, perhaps in the near future, may not be compelled to enter a grinding competition with each other and thus induce a ruinous decline of wages.

Mr. ADAMS. Are we protected against the capital of Europe?

Mr. McCALL. No; we do not need any protection against the capital of Europe. But I would like to ask my friend if he has not repeatedly held forth to the people of this country that we needed to protect our labor against the laborers of Europe?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; we do.

Mr. McCALL. And I would like to ask my friend further if he did not vote for this bill six years ago?

Mr. ADAMS. We do need to protect our labor against the laborers of Europe, but that is no reason why we should not allow others to come here to enjoy the privileges of this country;

and then we will protect them. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. If his object is to restrict immigration to this country, either in toto or any particular race, why not meet the issue fairly and squarely, and pass a law stopping all immigration, if that is the evil? Or, if it is against any particular race or class of people, why not pass a law against them, and not try by indirection, by an educational test, to get that done which you do not meet fairly and squarely? Do not keep out the honest, healthy man, who loves liberty as much as the most highly educated man in the world. Do not keep him out simply because he can not read and write. Let him contribute to the country his labor, which is just as valuable as money or any other consideration.

Mr. McCALL. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech, but I asked him if he did not vote for this proposition when it was before the House six years ago.

Mr. ADAMS. I think not.

Mr. McCALL. I should be very much surprised to find that the RECORD showed he did not.

Mr. ADAMS. I think not.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding:

"Provided, That all persons, whether able to read the English language or some other language or not able to do so, who shall enter the United States except at the seaports thereof, or at Vanceboro, Me.; Newport or St. Albans, Vt.; Plattsburg, Niagara Falls, or Buffalo, N. Y.; Detroit or Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; Pembina, N. Dak.; Sumas, Wash.; Laredo, El Paso, or Eagle Pass, Tex., or Nogales, Ariz., shall be adjudged to have entered the country unlawfully and shall be deported as by law provided."

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] desire to be heard in favor of the amendment which he has offered?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHATTUC. It is held out to us that it is the desire of a large number of gentlemen in this House to restrict immigration. If we take their word for it, that seems to be all they want; that they are honest in their declaration that they want to keep out undesirable immigration, or, as I put it, undesirable aliens. Now, to put up the barriers at New York and on the Atlantic seaboard, as is proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], is simply to send these rejected people around, to come in over our frontier through Canada. There is no question about this at all, that there are a hundred thousand who come in in that way every year.

There is no question at all but what at least 50 per cent of the paupers, the insane, and the people who are fit subjects for our penal and charitable institutions who are turned away from our shores at New York come in through Canada. Before we get through with this I am determined to know just what part of this House is absolutely sincere and acting in good faith in relation to these matters. I do not propose to let it go without a record. I propose to find out who these people are who stand here and brag all the while that a good German, a good Englishman, or a good Irishman should not come to this country when they are willing to turn the paupers and harlots and insane and thieves away from our Atlantic ports, only to allow them to go around through Canada and come into our country in that way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman from Ohio allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHATTUC. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Your amendment to my amendment is merely intended to designate the places at which immigrants shall come into this country?

Mr. SHATTUC. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am perfectly willing to accept that.

Mr. SHATTUC. Now, I want to say this, gentlemen: I see no objection to taking the question of an educational test up by itself, but it is my candid judgment that this bill ought not to meet with any riders at all. You also know that we have not revised the immigration laws for the last twenty-five years because certain elegant gentlemen of the East who have so many of these special features on their mind have persisted for years in forcing them to the front, and they kill every good measure by loading good bills down.

Now, I believe, with the advice of some distinguished attorneys of this House—the most distinguished, because I have never heard one of them deny it—that we can have an educational-test bill that would be satisfactory to every person here, and we can do it in such a way that it will not interfere with the treaty obligations that the United States has with other countries. I want

to urge you now to consider first one thing. Would it not be better to defeat this educational-test amendment now, entirely, and let it go back to the committee, and I will promise you a bill either for or against it? I do not know at this moment whether the members of the Committee on Immigration are for it or against it.

Now, I want to correct a statement made by the gentleman from Indiana yesterday, when he said he had it from me that my committee was against it. He never came before the committee. I do not want to impute to him any wrong. He did not intend to do so. He is one of those good attorneys that would not deliberately prevaricate and would not misrepresent. I do not now know how the committee stands. But I do protest in the interest of honest, fair play not to pile a lot of new issues on it and defeat the bill.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the gentleman one question. Mr. SHATTUC. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman says they will bring in a report either favoring an educational test or opposing it. How can the committee bring in a report opposing a bill and have it considered in this committee?

Mr. SHATTUC. You can tell better than I can, for you went to the Speaker and found out how.

Mr. WATSON. I found out that you could not do it.

Mr. SHATTUC. We could report.

Mr. WATSON. But the gentleman says he will bring in a report.

Mr. SHATTUC. I did say something of the kind.

Mr. WATSON. Whether the House is for it or is opposed to it; and if the committee is opposed to it, it stands on no ground.

Mr. SHATTUC. I said I would submit it to the committee and see if they would not do one thing or the other.

Mr. WATSON. If they do the other, we will be out.

Mr. SHATTUC. If you will get our great constitutional lawyers, and we have a great many of them here, to bring in a proper bill in favor of the educational test, I will guarantee that we will consider it in the committee, but I ask you, gentlemen, to let us pass this bill without any riders.

Mr. RAY of New York. I would like to ask a question in that connection. Have you discussed this matter of an educational test in connection with this bill in the committee? I do not ask what you said.

Mr. SHATTUC. We invited everybody that wanted to come before that committee.

Mr. RAY of New York. Was the question of the educational test discussed in your committee?

Mr. SHATTUC. We went over the matter. We have had hearings, but it was our understanding that it was better for us not to report one way or the other upon an educational test or on the questions affecting the Canadian frontier.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHATTUC. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHATTUC. Now, this bill that is presented by these two distinguished lawyers—and I guess they are, for both of them admit it, the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Indiana—is the most loosely drawn measure ever presented to this House, so far as I know. If I had a clerk 15 years of age who could not draw a better bill than that I would discharge him, and I have had many. Neither one of these gentlemen drew up this bill; neither one of them wrote a word of it. It says:

In addition to the persons excluded under the foregoing sections, admission into the United States shall be denied to all persons over 15 years of age and physically capable of reading who can not read the English language or some other language.

I want to state to these gentlemen who have been talking about Canada, in discussing another section of this bill, that you will have to have a man standing at the border with a primer and spelling blocks to see whether the immigrant is educated. "Every person coming into the United States must be able to read." That means a man coming from Canada or Mexico, and you could not enforce it if it passed.

Now, in my time I would like to have the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] state what he thinks about this proposed amendment. He was solicitor of the Treasury, and if you have any doubt about the constitutionality of this bill, refer to him. The Speaker having no confidence in me, because I was a plain ex-railroad man, did submit it to the gentleman from Iowa. Now, as an educational test, I would like to have the gentleman from Iowa analyze this proposed amendment and see if he does not think it is a monstrosity. [Laughter.]

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SHATTUC. Very well.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Section 2, the one under considera-

tion, provides that idiots and insane persons and epileptics, etc., shall be excluded; and also persons afflicted with diseases, etc.; and then at the end of the section is this proviso—

Mr. SHATTUC. That proviso has been amended.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Very well; that was done while I was out.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment, or rather a substitute, for the educational test, which in my judgment, and in the judgment of those who have given some attention to the great problem of immigration, will more effectually meet the evils of undesirable immigration than the amendment of my friend from Alabama. Before I offer it, however, I hope the committee will bear with me while I say a few words in regard to the educational test.

The amendment proposed means this, that every man or woman coming to the United States must show his or her ability to read 20 or 25 lines of the Constitution of the United States, and not until then will he or she be accorded the privilege of admission to this country.

Let us see what a President of the United States said on this proposition. I will read it myself. The same bill was before Congress a few years ago and a Democratic President vetoed it, and in doing so he used this language:

The best reason that could be given for this radical restriction of immigration is the necessity of protecting our population against degeneration and saving our national peace and quiet from imported turbulence and disorder.

I can not believe that we would be protected against these evils by limiting immigration to those who can read and write in any language twenty-five words of our Constitution. In my opinion it is infinitely more safe to admit a hundred thousand immigrants who, though unable to read and write, seek among us only a home and opportunity to work than to admit one of those unruly agitators and enemies of governmental control, who can not only read and write, but delights in arousing by inflammatory speech the illiterate and peacefully inclined to discontent and tumult. Violence and disorder do not originate with illiterate laborers. They are rather the victims of the educated agitator. The ability to read and write, as required in this bill, in and of itself, affords, in my opinion, a misleading test of contented industry and supplies unsatisfactory evidence of desirable citizenship or a proper apprehension of the benefits of our institutions. If any particular element of our illiterate immigration is to be feared for other causes than illiteracy, these causes should be dealt with directly, instead of making illiteracy the pretext for exclusion to the detriment of other illiterate immigrants against whom the real cause of complaint can not be alleged.

This, Mr. Chairman, states the case in a nut shell.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes; if the committee will extend my time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have fifteen minutes, reckoning from the time he started.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the gentleman from Missouri may use fifteen minutes for his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to ask the gentleman to let me read a few sentences from the message of another President in this connection.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. LEVER. Half a minute.

The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure by a careful and not merely perfunctory educational test some intelligent capacity to appreciate American institutions and act sanely as American citizens.

That is from the message of President Roosevelt December 3, 1901.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to that sentiment expressed by President Roosevelt in his great message, but it will be noted that the President carefully refrained from indorsing a proposition such as is offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LEVER. Now, will you allow me to read from the Republican platform of 1896?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Oh, no; we know all about that. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Perhaps it would do more good if the gentleman would read it to the other side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. WACHTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman from Missouri offer his amendment. I do not know what it is he is talking about.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment will be, in my judgment—and I have devoted twenty years to the study of the question of immigration—the effect of it, in my humble judgment, will be to shut out those whom we do want and to let in those whom we do not want. It will let in the soft-handed, easy-going fellow, and exclude the horny-handed son of toil. It welcomes the lazy, half-educated good-for-nothing who goes around asserting that the world owes him a living without condescending to work for it, and shuts the door of the Republic in the face of the honest, industrious, and struggling man who, though not able to read, comes here with two strong arms, a

healthy mind, and a determination to make this country his and his children's home, and to earn his citizenship as well as his daily bread by the sweat of his brow.

One is perhaps driven to these shores against his will and by circumstances he does not care to explain—I refer to the educated immigrant—while the other comes voluntarily, with the hope of a better future in his heart and with the expectation that by honest toil, to which he is accustomed, by thrift and frugality, he will succeed in making his lot a happy one, because he is in the land of civil and religious liberty of which he has heard so much and which has filled his dreams for many a day. Yet it is proposed here to extend the hand of welcome to the former and not only withhold it from the latter but to send him back to the dungeon whence he came.

Do you know what this means—the deportation of a man? It means that you brand him for life. When he goes back to his old surroundings the question will be naturally asked by his neighbors, "Why did you return? You must have committed some overt act, some crime or other which caused the great country beyond the seas to return you to your old home." Nobody in the whole civilized world will believe that this country would return an honest man merely because he has not had the opportunity of learning how to read. My friends, by adopting this amendment you would go on record as making it the standard of Americanism that a man, no matter whether he is honest, if he has not had the opportunity to learn, will be punished on account of the lack of that opportunity on his part and be sent back where he came from.

Heretofore the rule recognized by the American people has been that an honest man, with an honest willingness to become a good American citizen, and by honest work to help build up our great country, that such a man should be welcomed by us; and it is due to this policy, my friends, that our country has been built up.

Such arguments as those used to-day by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] we heard advanced in the early fifties, when the Know-Nothing party attempted to shut out all immigration for all time to come. Supposing, my friends, that that party could have had its way, supposing at that time all immigration should have been stopped, what would have been the result? Is there anyone here who believes that the United States would have made the strides that they have made? Or is it not a fact that since the Know-Nothing party was voted down and out, and because of the fact that the doors were kept open to worthy immigrants, the last fifty years have been the most prosperous and the most glorious period in the history of our country?

Mr. Chairman, I shall offer, when the proper time comes, the following substitute:

An examination, physical and other—

Meaning a mental as well as a physical examination.

Mr. WATSON. Why not say mental?

Mr. BARTHOLDT (reading):

An examination, physical and other, of every immigrant shall be made at the port of embarkation by the American consul at such port and by a medical officer designated by the Treasury Department for such purpose.

Mr. WACHTER. Why does not the gentleman include the word "mental" in describing the examination?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am willing to put that in.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And you ought also to insert the word "moral."

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am willing to accept the suggestions of these gentlemen and make the language of the amendment read:

An examination, physical, mental, and moral.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read, in support of this substitute, an extract from a letter written by a gentleman who is now in the consular service of this country, and who now enforces, without authority of law, this very provision. Here is his language:

This is probably the only United States consulate where for some years there has been a consular inspection of emigrants. Let me tell you how this work is being done, with a view to encouraging an effort to have this system of inspection extended to all seaports whence emigrants leave for the United States. In the height of the season from three to four steamers of the North German Lloyd Steamship Company leave this port every week and each steamer requires from two to three inspections of the steerage passengers. At first all the bedding of these people is ordered into the disinfecting chamber, then each person is vaccinated and his or her physical condition carefully examined into, special care being taken to detect diseases of the eyes, skin, lungs, and mind, etc. The examination takes place in the presence of the United States consul or one of his assistants, and is in charge of Dr. Peltzer, a sworn medical officer of our Government, who is assisted by one or two physicians of the Lloyd Steamship Company.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may continue his remarks for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, he continues:

As soon as trachoma, lupus, pulmonary phthisis, and certain other diseases or any mental trouble is discovered the person so afflicted is rejected, and the consul regularly sends the list of all rejected emigrants to the Commissioner of Immigration at New York or Baltimore or Galveston, whither the steamer

may be bound. At the same time the steamship company is also at once notified as to which passengers have been rejected at the consular inspection, whereupon they may, if they choose, investigate the cases more closely and determine for themselves whether or not they will risk taking such rejected passengers to the American port.

The system of consular inspection here at Bremen was introduced without any order from the State Department, but with its full sanction. If I am correctly informed it was begun at the request of the Lloyd people themselves, who evidently were prompted by a humane desire to have the fate of unfortunate emigrants decided at the earliest possible moment, and also by their own business interests, for it undoubtedly has saved them considerable sums of money to have people retained on this side who probably would have been excluded by the Treasury officials at our ports of entry and deported at the expense of the steamship company. And, as is well known also to the Department, the North German Lloyd Steamship Company spare neither pains nor money to have the inspection done right, and they regularly reimburse this consulate for the salary paid the examining physician.

Now, this is without authority of law. What we want is to get the authority of law for a system of this kind and pay the medical officer out of our own pocket. My friend writes further:

The records at the various immigration bureaus will show, I believe, that the work done at this port by the present system of consular inspection of emigrants has been fairly successful. I know that among the deported steerage passengers there are but very few that have passed the consular inspection at Bremen. In looking over the lists of such deported aliens which are regularly sent me I rarely ever find a person returned to Bremen on account of some physical disability, etc.

Mr. WACHTER. The main thing is not having a sufficient amount of money, is it not?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I propose that this substitute be adopted in place of the educational test. After deliberately thinking the matter over; after months of consultation with people who know all about the question of immigration, and after a practical test such as is described in this private letter, I have come to the conclusion that if you examine the emigrant on the other side, before you allow him to come over to this side and run the risk of inhuman treatment by having to deport him, we will meet all the evils that are now being complained of with relation to immigration.

Mr. WACHTER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. WACHTER. Does my friend not believe that if this educational test as proposed were adopted it would practically amount to an examination on the other side by the steamship owners? Would they not provide themselves with these cards, knowing that if they brought an undesirable person over here, one not admissible under the rule, that they would be compelled to take that person back? Would not they themselves make the examination on the other side in order to know that the person brought over here was admissible before bringing him?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Undoubtedly such would be the result, but I for one would prefer to have this system under the control and supervision of United States officers instead of leaving it to any steamship company or any of their agents.

Mr. WACHTER. The gentleman does not mean to do way with the examination on this side?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Not at all. The examination on this side will take place just the same.

Mr. WACHTER. And be of the same character as the examination on the other side?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I wish to merely suggest this to the gentleman: Does he not think that his foreign requirement or test would operate very seriously in excluding that German element who come to our country—young men who try to escape military duty? They come here for the purpose of escaping the military law, and if the test is put on them, as is proposed in your substitute, it would exclude that most worthy class. It would give notice of his purpose to come to the United States, and he would be stopped. That is what I mean.

Mr. LESSLER. They have an educational test at home. They can not get into the army without knowing how to read and write.

Mr. WACHTER. Oh, yes, they can.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I am not so certain. I do not want to put any obstruction in the way of a young German coming to our country. They can stand the educational test.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I think the gentleman confuses my proposition with another proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I want to say to my friend on the other side [Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama] that a suggestion has been made frequently in connection with the question of immigration, looking to the inauguration of a system of consular inspection—a general system of inspection to be applied by all our consuls on the other side. That would not be desirable, Mr. Chairman, for this reason, that no man could get a certificate from an American consul to allow him to emigrate to the United States who would be subject to military duty, because an American consul accredited to any European country would have to refuse such a permit to persons who were amenable to the laws of that country.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. That is what I think. I think that any notice that was required to be given on the other side by a consul will accomplish a thing that will not be desired in this respect, that it might exclude a number of young Germans who possibly can not read and write, who leave that country for the purpose of escaping military duty, and come to this country. That is what I mean.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I assure the gentleman that the adoption of my amendment will not militate against the coming here of any such desirable immigrants as those. The inspection under my system would be made by the consuls at the seaports only, and would not require the issue of certificates.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. It does not, then, go to the effect that any particular notice or publication would have to be given by the consul. I am opposed to having the test made at a foreign port. We must have the test made here at home.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Not at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. If that test is to be given on the other side of the waters, I should object to it, for the reason that it would tend to exclude, in my opinion, a desirable element of German young men who very properly seek this country for the purpose of avoiding military duty, and ought to be allowed to come to our country. This country needs and demands a fair and reasonable immigration test and qualification. I shall support such a test and qualification.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. This amendment provides that there shall be a test, "physical and mental." What mental test?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That would be left to the discretion of the Treasury Department and the State Department, under whose control the consuls are operating.

Mr. WATSON. Would they have the right, under the provisions of your amendment, to offer an educational test?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I suppose a consul, in determining whether an immigrant is worthy to become an American citizen, would go into the question of his mental qualifications certainly, even if, as is suggested by the other amendment, he would not require him to read the Constitution of the United States, an instrument which even very few of us thoroughly understand.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I will state to the gentleman that I am in hearty sympathy with what he has said—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I want to offer my substitute before my time expires.

Mr. SNODGRASS. What I wish to know is whether your amendment includes an examination as to moral qualification?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes; physical, mental, and moral.

Mr. SNODGRASS. That was the purpose of my amendment that I offered a while ago; but the gentleman has much better apprehended the scope of the evil to be avoided. I would ask him now if he has considered the cost of this medical examination?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I will say in reply to the gentleman that there are only five or six ports of embarkation in Europe. Consequently the expense would be very little, comparatively nothing.

Mr. CLARK. Really the expense under your system would not be as much as the expense under the present system.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Certainly not.

Mr. WACHTER. Is it provided that the present system of examination on this side is to be retained?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; but retaining it theoretically is not retaining it practically; and if Mr. BARTHOLDT's amendment is adopted, nine-tenths of the undesirable class will not get on the ships to come to this country at all.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of my substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri sends to the Clerk's desk a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUCK], and the Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for amendment providing for an educational test the following: "An examination, physical, mental, and moral, of every immigrant shall be made at the port of embarkation by the American consul at such port

and a medical officer designated by the Treasury Department for such purpose."

Mr. WACHTER. Would it not be proper to put the word "political" in there, in order to ascertain if they are anarchists?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is covered by another section.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], made by him yesterday in the discussion of this bill, left the impression that the American Revolution, which resulted in the establishment of this nation, was the outgrowth of the action of ignorant and illiterate men, and that the literate or educated men of the country were substantially a unit in opposing opposition to the British Crown.

Possibly that is not the idea the gentleman intended to convey, but his remarks made that impression upon my mind and upon the minds of others. He used the following language:

Now, looking over the history of my country, I do not find any justification for the theory that illiterate men have been especially harmful to the American Republic. Going back to the very dawn of our national existence, I find that the men who led the forces, the intellectual power that created the great organization of Tories in this country were all of them the very best educated men. I am going to point out now that no evil ever came to this country, no evil ever menaced this country from ignorant men, and, on the other hand, I affirm that such menace did come from the educated men.

Look at the teachings of the Tories of the Revolution, and I always look to those people with a kind of sympathy, for they were the "regulars" of that day and we were the "rebels." They were the "loyalists," as they always called themselves. But they do not stand very high in the estimation of the historian or of the American people. The leaders of that class were all of them educated in the New England colleges. Four men of one single family, who were the outspoken leaders of Toryism, were graduates of three of the New England colleges of that period, and the educated people of New England and New York and Pennsylvania and New Jersey were the leaders of the Tory party of that day.

I desire to combat, and do combat, most earnestly the general idea conveyed by the remarks quoted.

The leading Tories of Revolutionary times were not men of the highest education, although some of them were college graduates. In New England the ministers of the Episcopal Church were largely college graduates, and the Episcopal Church quite largely adhered to the Crown and opposed the Revolution. On the other hand, the members of the Congregational Church and the ministers of that denomination, and I include all churches except the Episcopal, almost uniformly espoused the cause of the Revolution. There had been much contention between the churches, and the Episcopal Church took sides with the Crown and against the colonies mainly because other churches opposed the Crown.

Who were the Tories? Says Ryerson in his work on *The Loyalists of America and their Times*, volume 1, page 505:

Many men of property and character in Massachusetts were in favor of England, partly from conviction and partly from fear. That large and often cultivated class called "conservatives," who hold by the past rather than hope for the future and are constitutionally timid, feared change; they were naturally Tories.

Ryerson defended the so-called Loyalists or Tories and was prejudiced in their favor, and nowhere does he claim or indicate that the Tories embraced the highly educated or even the highly educated classes of New England.

Says Hosmer in his life of Samuel Adams:

Though Boston lost before the Revolution the distinction of being the largest town in America, it remained the intellectual head of the country. Its common schools gave every child a good education, and Harvard College, scarcely out of sight and practically a Boston institution, gave a training hardly inferior to that of European universities of the day. * * * The churches were thronged on Sunday and at Thursday lecture as they have not been since. All classes were readers; the booksellers fill whole columns in the newspapers with their lists; the best books then in being in all departments of literature are on sale and in the circulating libraries. * * * Of course the folk-mote of such a town as this would have spirit and interest. Wrote a Tory in those days (Sagittarius): "The town meeting at Boston is the hotbed of sedition. * * * Massachusetts was unquestionably the leader in the Revolution. * * * There is no way of determining how many New England militia took the field during the strife; the multitude was certainly vast. The figures, however, as regards the more regular levies have been preserved and are significant. With a population comprising scarcely more than one-third of the inhabitants of the thirteen colonies, New England furnished 118,251 of the 231,797 Continental troops that figured in the war. Massachusetts alone furnished 67,907, more than one-quarter of the entire number. * * * As Massachusetts led the thirteen colonies, the town of Boston led Massachusetts."

And Samuel Adams, a college graduate, led Boston. The leaders in the American Revolution against the British Crown, both those in civil life and those who won distinction in the Army fighting against Great Britain, were nearly all college graduates. I give a list of some of the more prominent, with the names of the colleges from which they graduated, and I include New York because the gentleman from Ohio in his remarks included New York with New England.

John Adams, graduate of Harvard; John Hancock, graduate of Harvard; Samuel Adams, graduate of Harvard; James Otis, graduate of Harvard; Joseph Warren, of Massachusetts, graduate of Harvard; Gen. Henry Knox, well educated; Gen. Artemas Ward, graduate of Harvard; Gen. Timothy Pickens, graduate of Harvard; Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, well educated; Gen. David Wooster, of Connecticut, graduate of Yale College;

Capt. Nathan Hale, of Connecticut, graduate of Yale; Alexander Hamilton, Kings College, New York, now Columbia (did not graduate); Robert R. Livingston, Kings College; John Jay, Kings College; George Clinton, De Witt Clinton, graduate of Columbia College, of New York; Patrick Henry, not illiterate; Thomas Jefferson, College of William and Mary; James Madison, Princeton College; James Monroe, William and Mary College (did not graduate); George Washington, of Virginia; Gen. Nathaniel Greene, Rhode Island, highly educated; Gen. Thomas Mifflin, Pennsylvania, graduate of Philadelphia College.

It is true that in the years immediately succeeding the close of the Revolutionary war less attention was given to education throughout New England and the entire thirteen colonies than formerly. This grew out of the fact that the eight years' war had impoverished the country, and the people were neither able to support the common schools or send their children to college or give much, if any, attention to education. All their energies were bent to the restoration of material prosperity.

The opposition in New England to the war of 1812 was not due to the ignorance of her people, but to the exposure of her coasts to the ravages of British fleets and armies and to the crippling of her merchant marine and business interests.

No man can point to a single Tory who won distinction in the Revolutionary war fighting against the cause of the colonies who was a highly educated man. On the other hand, as the list shows, those who won the highest distinction in the Revolutionary war fighting for American independence and managing the civil affairs of the governments of the colonies were highly educated men and mainly college graduates.

Equally absurd is the claim of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] that only the ignorant should or do perform ordinary manual labor.

What are we to say of Lincoln, the rail splitter; Garfield, the canal driver, and Grant, the farmer and tanner? These men studied and read beneath the stars or behind the chinks of log cabins, and despised not manual labor, and won their way to the very highest places among their fellow-citizens.

To-day in all the walks of life we find the boys who have not the advantages of school or college educating themselves, and they despise not manual labor, nor do they regard it as degrading. Toil in the ditch or behind the plow, if it be necessary to earn an honest living, is no disgrace to any man, whether he be ignorant or educated. In the South to-day, where factories are springing up, the owners open schools and give the children and young men and women an opportunity to gain education, because educated labor is the more desirable and the more valuable.

I repudiate the idea that education lifts a man above honest manual labor or that honest manual labor degrades the educated man. Perish the thought that we must keep men in ignorance if we would have workers in wood and toilers in the field and mechanics in the workshops, or import ignorant labor if we would have our ditches dug, our crops planted, and our factories kept in operation.

We have not forgotten the learned blacksmith nor the hewer of stone who in old Scotland revolutionized the science of geology. Hugh Miller, with more learning than many a king, thought it no disgrace to fashion and place the stone as a common mason.

No more dangerous doctrine can be taught in this Republic than that which implies that the educated young man is above placing his hand to the plow or fashioning the machinery that moves the world. If anything makes a nation great and free and independent it is educated labor—men and women who are self-reliant because intelligent and well educated, who are willing and able to work with both hands and mind when occasion arises. That man is successful in life who, knowing how, is willing and not ashamed to do any work that ought to be done. The man who knows the qualities of iron and steel takes delight in fashioning them into useful implements, while the ignorant man beats into shape because it brings him bread. While doing his work the ignorant man is discontented and surly because his mind is indolent and unfed and unthinking. He wonders why others who work by his side are cheerful and contented. He does not appreciate that the difference comes from the broader views given the one above the other by reason of education and an understanding of the results to be accomplished and the good to come from the labor performed.

I insist that the prominence of our institutions of free government depends not on our wealth, but on the intelligence of the educated masses, and that if we would escape revolution we must see to it that our common-school system is perpetuated and extended and that well-educated men and women fill every department of life, high and low, and take pride in pursuing any and every avocation necessary to the existence and growth and development of a prosperous people and nation.

I have always believed and I still believe that our patriot fathers who fought at Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill;

at Bennington and Saratoga; at Trenton, Princeton, King's Mountain and Yorktown, were intelligent and as well educated as the times would permit. I am of the opinion that the more education a man has the more he loves and longs for and appreciates liberty and good government—republican government—the more he desires to have a hand in governmental affairs.

Absolute monarchies exist because of the ignorance of the people. With the growth and spread of education has departed the glory of the throne and crown and scepter. Educated people repudiate the doctrine of the divine right of kings and teach the divine right of men to organize and govern themselves, in accordance with the intelligent popular will.

Educated men understand and respect law and good government. Ignorance bows to force because it fears, but neither understands nor appreciates the government under which it exists.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMT] by no means meets the object that will be accomplished by the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. The one will not lessen immigration and the other will.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said much about the quality of the immigrants that have come into this country, and of course we are all immigrants or the descendants of them. But I want to say to the committee that the most important question is not about the quality, but about the quantity, of the immigrants that are coming into this country.

We have had before us, in reference to various measures, remonstrances and delegations from trades unions that represent the great mass of wage-workers in this country, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that this measure that we are voting on now is of more importance to the wage-earners of this country than all the other bills that will be passed at this session a hundredfold over.

The one thing of greatest importance in the future development of this country, for its prosperity, and even for its safety and preservation, is that the great mass of the people should receive sufficient wages to maintain a reasonable standard of comfort and orderly living. It is not a question of quantity in the number of our people, but of quality; it is not how many millions of population shall we have, but what sort of a population shall it be.

No man can deny that the question of wages has got to be decided by the law of supply and demand. Why did we vote almost unanimously for the Chinese-exclusion bill? Because every man said and every man believed that to bring in possibly five or ten million Chinese immigrants would sooner or later reduce the price of wages in this country. Is there anyone who believes that this great body of five or six hundred thousand immigrants can continue to come in yearly without reducing the average price paid to wage-earners as soon as bad times come, and come they will, necessarily. And if there shall be in this country, whose Government rests upon universal suffrage, large masses of men who are not paid sufficient sums to satisfy their needs and to enable them to maintain their present condition of comfort, discontented, half paid, and half employed—is there any man in this committee who does not believe we shall have social troubles far more dangerous than those which arose from the existence of slavery fifty years ago? The advantage of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is that it will, to a very considerable extent, lessen the body of immigration coming into the country by excluding those who can not read.

It is idle to say, no matter what the condition of prosperity may be, that any employer of labor pays more than he must pay. I do not care how much any man is making, he does not pay the wage-earner \$2 a day if any other man turns up who is willing to accept a dollar a day. If you have more laborers than labor, prices for work will go down and no one can help it. The theory on which protection is based is that it keeps up the price of wages, and that the salvation, safety, and prosperity of the country depends upon a reasonably high standard of wages and of general comfort and well-being.

Now, Mr. Chairman, does anyone believe that you can permanently keep up a high scale of wages by keeping out the product of pauper labor and letting in the pauper laborer himself? My friend from Missouri said that this country should be the asylum of the distressed of all nations. A great immigration was beneficial when we had 3,000,000 people in this country and untold millions of acres of vacant land. Now we have 80,000,000 people and the land still vacant is arid.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Do not the provisions of this bill prevent the immigration of paupers?

Mr. PERKINS. The term pauper labor is figurative. It means the men who work for a price materially less than the working-men of this country are willing to take, or ought to be asked to take.

Now, what we should consider, Mr. Chairman, is not the distress of other nations, but to do the most we can to avert distress in this nation. There is a natural increase with 80,000,000 of population of over 500,000 every year, and unless we see to it that those children that every day are coming into the world, American born, who will be American bred, shall have the facilities for comfort that their parents had, unless we see to it that we will leave behind us a bad heritage. We must see to it for their sake and for our own sake. Their prosperity and the national safety are linked together.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in regard to the general features of this bill, I approve it. I believe it is a good bill. I believe that the chairman of the committee is entitled to the thanks of this House for the perseverance with which he has labored to prepare it and get it before us. I approve of the bill, however, because of its prohibitory features; because it restricts immigration; and I am not averse to amending it and making it better by still further prohibition.

I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that he is mistaken in the opinion he expressed about "the gentleman from Iowa" being a Know-nothing. I lived in the days of Know-nothingism. I was opposed to all of the ideas of that party at that time. The questions that were presented then are not the questions of to-day. At that time, as the gentleman from New York has said, there were thousands and tens of thousands of square miles of prairie inviting the settler. We wanted immigration; and I am opposed to immigration now in part because there are no more lands; because immigration congests itself in the cities; because the people that come often are disappointed and are not benefited.

I do not object to immigration simply because of the degenerating effects upon our population. After a little time that difficulty is effaced. But I am opposed to it, among other things, because it is harmful, as I believe, to the very best interests of the United States and the very perpetuity of the United States. What sacrifices do we make in order to enlarge the labor field of the people of the United States? Every Republican who votes for a tariff proposition does it for what reason? Not simply that it will benefit us for a moment in extending, possibly, our commerce and give us a home market, but to enlarge the labor field and make more places where Americans can work, to raise the wage and keep it up to its standard. That is why we make these sacrifices, and that is what I think to-day is the great labor of statesmanship for the American people—to see to it that the labor field of the United States furnishes a place where every laborer may work and receive a fixed wage for his day's work.

As long as that can be done there will be contentment in our homes; as long as that can be done that contentment gives permanency, perpetuity, to our institutions. No man seeks a change who is prosperous under present conditions; and therefore I am unwilling to jeopardize that labor field that we have built up and extended at so great a cost to ourselves by flooding it with irresponsible people that we have no interest in. Every one of these 250,000 laborers that have come into the United States this year, and the number will be larger than that, is here to seek the place of some American laborer, to seek a place in this labor field even now too restricted. I do not want to subject our own people to this competition.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit me an interruption?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, if it is a question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If the argument of the gentleman is true, then would he not be willing to propose a bill to shut the doors of the Republic against all immigration?

Mr. HEPBURN. That is impractical—that would disrupt the pleasant relations that exist between ours and other nations. But I want to approach to that point as rapidly and as completely as we can. I do not want to be offensive to other nations—I do not want to excite reprisals in other directions on the part of other nations, but I do want to keep this labor field of America for Americans. [Applause.] That is the reason why I want to keep these people out.

We could do it if it was not for the congested condition of the cities. The gentleman from Missouri has a large German population in his city, and for some reason or other these gentlemen want their associates—their old friends—to share with them the blessings that they have. Another gentleman has an immense Polish population in his city, and he wants to conciliate their kindly feelings or secure them by letting their friends and their relatives come in and share with them.

Now, I think we ought to take a broader view than that; we ought to look at the situation as it is, as it affects the whole country and as it affects this labor field of ours, because that is the one thing that the Democrats and Republicans alike ought to look to. I can see a gradual change in the opinions of very many gentlemen on the other side of this House. The importance of

the labor field and the necessity for preserving it for our own people has impressed itself on them.

Mr. STORM. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, if it is a question.

Mr. STORM. As I understand, a laborer is different from a mechanic. A mechanic comes here and is educated and can read and write, but laborers we do not raise in this country; we do not raise American laborers, as I understand it, nor American domestic servants, and, therefore, the remarks of the gentleman that they come in competition with ours does not apply.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, I think that is a distinction too refined for the comprehension of anybody except from the gentleman's own locality. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will occupy it to answer the question of the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether, in his opinion, the turning out of the noneducated laborers would affect the field of labor where there is a great surplus of labor as much as it would the farm laborers, and whether there is a great surplus in that direction now?

Mr. HEPBURN. No man that comes to this country or that ought to come to this country comes here with the expectation of always being a laborer. While that may be his vocation when he comes, if he is such a one as is fit to come, he aspires to other places speedily, to fitting himself for competition with the higher classes.

Mr. MANN. If that is true, it would have the effect to restrict immigration.

Mr. HEPBURN. If it does that, it pleases me. I was going to say that the gentleman from Illinois did not vote against it before, but I believe he was not here.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. I was here and voted against it before. I know I did on one or two occasions, at least.

Mr. HEPBURN. That may be, but the RECORD I had before me did not show that.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question.

Mr. HEPBURN. Very well.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The question may seem academical, but it is in the light of history very real indeed. Is it or not true that every immigrant who comes here is not only a producer, but also a consumer; and that, in the language of one whom I consider the greatest Speaker the House of Representatives ever had, Mr. Thomas B. Reed, "every immigrant practically brings his job with him?"

Mr. HEPBURN. And he does not take some other man's job?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. He does not.

Mr. HEPBURN. I supposed he did.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. He does not, and he furnishes a job for somebody else. In that light, if the gentleman looks at it he will see it with entirely different eyes from what he does now.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the gentleman refer to that as a question? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I asked if he is not a consumer.

Mr. HEPBURN. Right here I want to call attention to that portion of the veto message of a President which the gentleman did not name, and as a comment upon that I want to call attention to the fact that this House by a vote of 195 to 37 registered their disagreement with the opinion that the gentleman quoted with so much confidence.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. SHATTUC. That measure to which you now refer as having received so large a vote—is that now a law?

Mr. HEPBURN. Probably not.

Mr. SHATTUC. What became of it?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not remember now. I think it was lost in the Senate.

Mr. WATSON. It failed in the Senate.

Mr. HEPBURN. But it passed the House originally by a vote of 217 to 36.

Mr. SHATTUC. The contention that I now make with the gentleman from Iowa is that this bill, if you tack this amendment on it, will meet the same fate exactly as that did.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think not; I hope not. If I thought that was true I would not vote for it.

Mr. SHATTUC. I am trying to persuade you that it is true.

If you gentlemen would only wait and let your committee bring in its bill, constructed on proper lines, I guarantee that the House will pass this bill and that one too; and that will be a great improvement on your amendment. That is my argument.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, in reference to immigration into this country the great question as to the welfare of the country is as to the character of the immigrant. Whatever test of character may be applied, the desirability of the immigrant as a citizen of the United States is the all-important question.

Is education—the ability to read and write—any test of real character? I know some people who can read a good many languages, yet who in what we call common sense and wisdom are great fools. To exclude from this country a class of immigration that would depreciate the quality of our civilization is proper. For that reason we exclude the Chinese. The Chinese people in character and in all the elements that go to make up good society as we understand it, would not be a desirable part of our population. Hence Congress has by law excluded that class of foreign people.

I am in favor of Asia for the Asiatics, for the reason that the Almighty, in His providence, has placed different races on different portions of the earth. Paul, on Mars Hill, said to the Athenians that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation."

Asiatic civilization is peculiar. The Asiatic people have characteristics that it will take long generations to change so as to adapt them to our civilization. Hence there is a propriety in their exclusion. But the races that can be assimilated with our population and become a part of the society in which we live, whose characteristics make them desirable citizens, why should they be excluded on a mere educational test? Our Republic stands, the great beacon light on the shores of time, beckoning all the races of men on to a higher and more glorious destiny.

Why should we exclude them from a home on our shores when they are in all the elements of character fitted to become a part of the great elements of our strength and of our wealth—pioneers in the wilderness in time of peace and soldiers in time of war—ready when the rights or welfare of their adopted country are at stake to peril their lives, the same as the native born? Education has nothing to do with the great elements of character. The man surrounded by his family at his humble fireside is growing up in American society, under the influence of American schools, and his offspring in the first or second generation can not be distinguished from native-born Americans.

Why exclude that class of people, whose only defect is their condition in life, made so under the governments under which they were born? Why shut them out? Why deprive them of the opportunity of working out a better and a higher destiny for themselves and their children when they can not injure our civilization, but are calculated to aid like other citizens in advancing it?

A test applied to the human brain that would determine its intelligence, if there was such a test, might be desirable. But there is no yardstick or scales that can determine the question of a man's common sense, his honesty, his integrity, his frugality. A man who possesses these qualifications is a good citizen, though he may not be able to write his name or to read a word of the Constitution. If he is law-abiding, peaceable, ready to discharge the duties of a citizen, why should he be excluded from our shores?

Our fathers all came from abroad. They sought this New World, bequeathed by Columbus to mankind, and why exclude the unfortunate portion of the race, guilty of no crime and possessed of the same elements—energy, enterprise, and frugality—as the best of their fellow-citizens, who in their adopted country become as patriotic as any others?

Why, then, apply any test except that which may be applied as tests of character, not of acquisitions of learning? Make the qualification for voting what you please, but let there be no qualification which will exclude a man of good character and morals from the opportunity to earn his livelihood with his own right arm under God Almighty's sunshine on the face of any portion of God's earth. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment and the amendment thereto close in ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks that debate on the amendment presented by him and on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri close in ten minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman make that twenty minutes, so that I may have ten minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will suggest to the gentleman from

Ohio that we agree to twenty minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman in charge of the bill and one-half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama amends his request and asks that debate on the amendment and the substitute be closed in twenty minutes, one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HILL. I shall not object to this request, but I shall object to any extension of time after this on any portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending section and amendment thereto be closed in twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on the two amendments and the substitute be closed in twenty minutes.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CORLISS. Will the adoption of that motion bar additional amendment to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. Any additional amendments may be offered, but debate on the section and all amendments thereto will be closed.

Mr. CORLISS. Then I submit I should object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that ample opportunity will be given to all members of the committee to offer amendments.

Mr. CORLISS. I would like to ask if that motion would debar debate on my amendment which I propose to offer and which has no relevancy to the question under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion was to close debate on the section and all amendments.

Mr. CORLISS. I propose to offer an amendment to an entirely different section on a different subject, which will be in the nature of an additional section to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I will state to the gentleman from Michigan that this motion would not affect debate on his proposed amendment. The motion of the gentleman from Alabama does not relate to any other than the question included in his motion. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to close debate on the amendment and the substitute in twenty minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, as there was no division of time, I ask recognition, and I yield ten minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC].

Mr. SHATTUC. Where did you get ten minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, there was no division of time, and I ask recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama that we are still under the five-minute rule. His motion did not take it out of the five-minute rule. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my objections to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOLT]. I did not intend to address the committee further, but I wish to state this: that the gentleman has offered a substitute to the educational test proposed by me, a provision that all immigrants who come to this country must stand a mental test, a physical test, and a moral test by the consular service of the United States. Now, if you are opposed to an educational test, why should you be in favor of this test, because you leave it entirely to the Department to determine what the test would be, and it would probably be along the same lines?

Why should you accept this other test and put the Government to the expense of appointing the consuls to do this work, appointing the examining physicians to do this work, requiring them to go to the consular officer and get their certificate, and as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON], my colleague, said, if that is the case, if they are required to go to a consular office, that consular office could not give a certificate without violating the comity between this country and other countries to a young man running away from there in violation of the military laws or any other laws, regardless of this test; but if you accept the amendment that I offer, the emigrant does not have to go to any consular office; he does not have to stand an educational test until he comes here to make a living. He may leave there because he does not want to serve in the army, but when he comes here there is no question raised if he can pass the educational test; he is admitted.

No one of them would be brought over here unless he was qualified, and why? Because the amendment provides that the

steamship company must carry the emigrant back who can not pass the test. Therefore, the steamship companies, in order to protect themselves, will apply the test to them before they start; not because of their regard for our law, but as a protection to themselves, so that they will not have to carry the immigrants back at their own expense.

As far as the Germans are concerned, I believe my friend stated yesterday that only about 2 per cent or 2½ per cent of the people of that nationality are illiterate. The figures I had showed a little more than that; but of the German immigrants coming to this country it would only exclude about 2 or 3 out of every 100, whereas it would exclude 43 or 45 per cent of the undesirable classes.

Now, I say, in reference to this amendment, the question simply is whether you are going to stand for home and country, or whether you are going to stand as a matter of sentiment for the indiscriminate, uneducated classes of Europe. You may give your sympathy and your sentiment to those poor unfortunate people, but are you going to bring them here to uplift them at the expense of your own people? I say that this proposition is to uplift the American wage-earner, to hold up the standard of American living, to hold up the American standard of civilization, and no self-respecting voter in this country will ever reprove a man who stands here and votes to uphold the American standard in that respect.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, a great many members of the committee have asked me how the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization stand on this amendment. I have no doubt there are several members of the committee who agree with my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] as to the merits of the amendment that he has introduced. The difference of opinion begins right here. They want to see some legislation pass this House that will become a law. They want to do something that will amount to something. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] professes great regard for the American workingman, but he is pursuing such a policy that it will do the American workingman no good at all, but will do him harm instead, because the measure that the gentleman advocates will not become a law, and he will also defeat the bill on which the committee have worked so hard to perfect it and get it before the House for action.

Now, what you ought to do is to reject this educational test as an amendment to this bill. Set it aside; pass this bill that has been so favorably spoken of by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEBURN]. No man in this House understands the value of it better than does the gentleman from Iowa, because he was for a long time the Solicitor-general of the Treasury Department, and it is admitted by everyone that he was the best one the Government ever had, and he is familiar with this subject, and he speaks advisedly when he says it is an excellent bill. Now, I say to you gentlemen in good faith that if you follow the lead of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and of the distinguished lawyer from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and attach this amendment to this bill, you may pride yourselves that you have accomplished a great result; but I ask you to watch and see if this bill does not go into a pigeonhole in the Senate, never to be heard of again.

On the other hand, reject this educational test, report this bill favorably to the House, let the House pass a properly constructed, legal bill, one that the Supreme Court of the United States will uphold, and we will send such a bill to the Senate as will receive favorable action there. If the House will do this, I pledge you that my committee, because I have just this moment consulted with the members of it, will report to this House within ten days a bill on the subject of the educational test, drawn on proper lines, in a way that will give no offense to other nations, and that will reach that class of people whom we want to reach. Now, I ask you in good faith to vote against this amendment. Vote against both of them; but if you must vote for either one of them, vote for the one introduced by the gentleman, my friend from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri was offered as a substitute for the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], because the two amendments are not in conflict, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri might just as well have been offered as an independent section; so that the friends of the educational qualification might have voted for his amendment, because I think it will serve a good purpose. It is to provide for an inspection and examination of those immigrants in order to determine, in advance of their landing on our shores, as to whether or not they would be qualified for citizenship when they come here. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is to attach an educational restriction or qualification. For that reason I shall have to vote against the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri, because it is

offered as a substitute for the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are ten minutes remaining of the time allowed for debate on this section.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, in answer to what my genial friend from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] has said, I want to read the Republican platform of 1896.

For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor, we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

That is a specific indorsement of the pending proposition. And in 1900 the Republican national platform contained this clause:

In the further interest of American labor we favor a more effective restriction of cheap labor from foreign lands.

Mr. SHATTUC. We have that.

Mr. WATSON. Who is disputing that?

Mr. SHATTUC. Nobody.

Mr. WATSON. Then, in further answer to my friend, I will state that in the Fifty-fourth Congress this very proposition passed the House, passed the Senate, and went to the President of the United States, but he vetoed it, and the House then passed it by a two-thirds vote over his head, and it went to the Senate where it failed of the required vote.

Subsequently, when Senator LODGE was chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, this very proposition was presented and passed. Subsequently, when Senator FAIRBANKS, from my own State, was chairman of the Committee on Immigration of the Senate, this very proposition was presented to that body and passed. Now, what right has the gentleman from Ohio to assume, when this measure has passed the Senate once when it was Democratic and twice when it was Republican, that the proposition as now stated would not pass the United States Senate?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It is not the same proposition, if I may so state to the gentleman. The bill that passed the House and was vetoed by President Cleveland was afterwards passed over the veto of President Cleveland by this House and failed finally in the Senate, was a bill which only applied to male immigrants. It excluded females, and it contained a number of other modifications which, in my judgment, are absolutely necessary to perfect legislation of this kind. It was not to strike down the proposition which is now submitted.

Mr. WATSON. The bill was practically the educational qualification as provided in this bill, because when I drew the bill I went back to the original Lodge bill, as presented in the Fifty-fourth Congress, and took almost identically the same language; and my friend from Missouri was on the committee at the time the bill was reported.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I was chairman of the committee.

Mr. WATSON. Was chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And I reported it by instructions of the committee.

Mr. WATSON. I did not know how that was; but I know the gentleman reported the bill, and I believe in the passage of the bill and voted for it, but refused to pass it over the President's veto, if I remember correctly. However that may be, I am in favor of the qualification as provided in this proposition, because it accomplishes what ought to be accomplished. And in answer to my friend, the distinguished and venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania, permit me to say we do not exclude any great number of Germans. It will exclude but a small number of Swedes and Norwegians and English and Scotch and Irish and Welsh, but it will have the result of excluding great hordes of Italians and Huns who come in year after year, undermining the very principles of this Republic and interfering with labor all over this country. Labor everywhere is in favor of this. I have a letter from Samuel Gompers, who is president of the American Federation of Labor, that has just reached me, and I will send it to the Clerk's desk and ask to have it read in my time as the conclusion of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Several MEMBERS. Ask unanimous consent to have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to have the letter read.

Mr. WATSON. I understand my friend from Connecticut said that he would not agree to any unanimous consents, and I do not care to run against any Connecticut snags.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks

unanimous consent that the letter may be printed as a part of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAMS. I object.

Mr. SULZER. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter read.

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman from Connecticut said that he would not grant any more unanimous consents. Why should he, therefore, be entitled to the courtesy?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that it may be read. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the time has been limited already to twenty minutes. It will take about five minutes to read the letter. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be allowed five minutes after the reading of the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that there are five minutes of the twenty minutes of limitation still remaining. The Chair is of the opinion that the unanimous consent will not take away the time given for debate. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and the Clerk will read the letter.

The letter was read, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1902.

Hon. JAMES E. WATSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have observed with much pleasure your activity in the cause of the regulation of immigration, and in particular your introduction of a bill providing that no adult immigrant shall be admitted to our country till he has acquired the first rudiments of education. It is for this reason that I now address you with regard to pending and prospective legislation.

The organized workers of the country feel that the existing immigration laws, while not without their value, are of trifling effect compared with the needs and the just demands of American labor.

The elaborate bill reported to the House by the Committee on Immigration is for the most part a simple codification of the existing laws, and modifies them only in some few details. I believe that the changes proposed are for the most part desirable. They are, however, comparatively unimportant. If it is worth while to take up the question of immigration at all, it is worth while to introduce a genuine and effective regulation.

The strength of this country is in the intelligence and prosperity of our working people. But both the intelligence and the prosperity of our working people are endangered by the present immigration. Cheap labor, ignorant labor, takes our jobs and cuts our wages.

The fittest survive; that is, those that fit the conditions best. But it is the economically weak, not the economically strong, that fit the conditions of the labor market. They fit best because they can be got to work cheapest. Women and children drive out men, unless either law or labor organization stops it. In just the same way the Chinaman and others drive out the American, the German, the Irishman.

The tariff keeps out cheap foreign goods. It is employers, not workmen, that have goods to sell. Workmen sell labor, and cheap labor is not kept out by the tariff. The protection that would directly help the workers is protection against the cheap labor itself.

The Nashville convention of the American Federation of Labor, by a vote of 1,858 to 352, pronounced in favor of an educational test for immigrants. Such a measure would check immigration in a moderate degree, and those who would be kept out by it are those whose competition in the labor market is most injurious to American workers. No other measure which would have any important effect of this kind is seriously proposed.

The need of regulation may be less sharply felt at the present time, when there are less men out of work than there were a few years ago. But the flood of cheap labor is increasing, and its effect at the slightest stagnation in industry or in any crisis will be fearful to the American workmen.

A fall in wages or a relative fall of wages makes the workers unable to buy as large a share as before of the goods they produce. This hastens the time when overproduction or underconsumption will show itself. That means hard times; and when hard times come the mass of immigrants that prosperity attracted will be here to increase the burden of unemployment.

For these reasons the American Federation of Labor believes that the present opportunity ought not to be allowed to pass without the adoption of an effective measure for the protection of American labor.

I earnestly hope that you will be able to procure the embodiment of an illiteracy test for immigrants in the bill (H. R. 12199) which the House now has under consideration.

I have the honor to remain, yours, very respectfully,

SAM. J. GOMPERS.

President American Federation of Labor.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I merely desire to give expression to one thought in answer to the argument of my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. The difference between the substitute offered by myself and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is that my substitute tends to relieve the American people and this country from the stigma and the meaning of the word "deportation." That is a word not contained in the lexicon of American history, a word not employed as yet by any American statesman whose lessons we care to obey and follow, a word comparatively new in the politics of this country. If you adopt my substitute the undesirable immigrant will be barred upon the other side. If you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama he will come across the ocean, and the American people will stand charged in the face of the civilized world with attempting to brand for life, and send back to his old home, a man merely because he is unable to read, because perhaps he has not had the opportunity of acquiring that knowledge.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. To which gentleman does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. "How happy I would be with either if the other dear charmer was away." [Laughter.] I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ADAMS. Perhaps we are both to ask the same question. I should like to ask whether the gentleman from Missouri has looked into the question of how the foreign governments would regard the provision that our consuls were to pass on the qualifications of their people?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I have, and there is absolutely no objection on the part of any government on the face of the earth, because the same practice is now in vogue in several ports of embarkation without the authority of law. I want to give that practice the authority of American law. And I will say that while the examination will take place practically upon foreign soil, it will really take place within the jurisdiction of the American consul. As soon as the American consul begins the examination and inspection of the immigrant, from that moment the immigrant is practically within the scope of our jurisdiction. Now I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. On page 10 of the pending bill, line 11, in italics, it provides that the officer at the ports of arrival shall make the examination, and the present law provides for an examination to be made at the place of embarkation. If the present law were incorporated into this, will the gentleman state how an immigrant entitled to admission to this country could be returned?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that my friend from New York has misunderstood the remarks which I have submitted. It is not the fact that the present law provides for any inspection and examination on the other side of the ocean. Not at all. It is only a practice which has been tried in several ports of embarkation and has worked very satisfactorily, so much so that no immigrant who has come to this country has been rejected on this side, because he has already passed a rigid examination on the other side.

Mr. SULZER. Does not the gentleman think that the examination ought to be made at the place of arrival as well as at the place of embarkation?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. My substitute does not exclude an examination on this side at all.

Mr. SULZER. It only provides for an examination at the place of embarkation?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired, debate on the amendment is exhausted, and the Chair will state the present parliamentary situation.

There is pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama inserting a new section in the bill after section 2, on page 4. To the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama the gentleman from Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Immigration, has submitted an amendment. The gentleman from Missouri has offered a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama. The question, therefore, will first be upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. When this amendment is disposed of, whether adopted or rejected, the question will recur on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again read the amendment.

The question was considered; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WACHTER) there were 54 ayes and 13 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I want to offer to the pending amendment which I think will take the precedence of the substitute.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HILL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 989. An act to authorize the Light-House Board to pay to Chamblin, Delaney & Scott the sum of \$1,704.46.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 14018. An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes.

IMMIGRATION.

The committee resumed its session.

The amendment proposed by Mr. LITTLE was read, as follows:

In the amendment of Mr. UNDERWOOD strike out "eighteen" and insert "twenty;" so as to read "under twenty years of age."

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri as an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from Iowa that the vote now about to be taken—

Mr. LACEY. I offer as an amendment the same language which the gentleman from Missouri has offered as a substitute. If the proposition of the gentleman from Missouri be adopted as a substitute, of course the original goes out.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I submit that the amendment has already been perfected by the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio—

Mr. LACEY. It has not been perfected.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And the vote now recurs on the substitute offered by myself, which can not now be offered as an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] that the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama is still before the House, subject to perfection by amendment. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LACEY. I offer it in the same language as the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri, but as an amendment, not as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that he offer his amendment in writing as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LACEY. Very well. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama by adding the following at the end thereof:

An examination, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that there is now pending before the House the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama—

Mr. LACEY. And I offer an amendment to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has offered a substitute to that amendment; and the Chair suggests that the gentleman from Iowa can not in the way he proposes appropriate the paper pending as a part of the files of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. LACEY. I do not understand that there is any patent on it. The proposition is now offered in the nature of an amendment. This is a different proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the rule, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa should be reduced to writing and offered by him as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LACEY. That point was not made. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I call for a vote on the substitute.

Mr. LITTLE. As an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, I move the language which I send to the desk, to come in at the end of that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the educational examination herein provided for may be made by the consul of the United States at the port of embarkation, under such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN (having put the question). The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 43, noes 53.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] is rejected. The question is now on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri, unless the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] has his amendment ready to offer.

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] offered the same thing substantially.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is then on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SULZER. I ask that the substitute be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the amendment of Mr. UNDERWOOD providing for an educational test the following:

"An examination, physical, mental, and moral, of every immigrant shall be made at the port of embarkation by the American consul at such port and by a medical officer designated by the Treasury Department for such purpose."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The regular order.

The CHAIRMAN (having put the question on the substitute of Mr. BARTHOLDT). The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I call for a division.

Mr. ADAMS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. If this substitute is adopted, does that pass it finally?

The CHAIRMAN. If the substitute be adopted, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama falls.

The question being again taken on the substitute of Mr. BARTHOLDT, there were ayes 34, noes 75.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order now to offer the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri as an independent section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that until this section is disposed of an independent section can not be taken up.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be in order at the present time. This section is now being perfected, and the vote recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I call for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Then I desire to offer it after the section is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SHATTUC. I call for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The House divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Eighty-six gentlemen vote in the affirmative.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio withdraws his demand for a division.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I renew the demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois renews the demand for a division. Those opposed will rise and remain standing until counted.

The division was completed.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 86 and the noes are 7, so the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, I now offer the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri as an independent section.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the present section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that this present section, section 3, has been agreed to. No other amendments to that section are now in order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand it is not completed until all amendments are disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. All amendments and the substitute and the new section offered by the gentleman from Alabama have been disposed of.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I had an amendment to the first part of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. All sections have been disposed of. The gentleman from Tennessee offers as a separate section the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. An examination, physical, mental, and moral, of every immigrant shall be made at the port of embarkation by the American consul at such port and a medical officer designated by the Treasury Department for such purpose.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, the effect of that amendment is to add an additional moral qualification, which is not provided for in this bill, I think. It also operates for the convenience of the emigrant, and as it can be carried out with very little additional expense, I think it ought to be adopted as an independent section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, which is a new section, as section 4 of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GLENN) there were—ayes 33, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, when section 2 was passed unanimous consent was given to recur to that section for the purpose of offering the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 2, page 4, add the following:

"Provided that such persons are not within other excluded classes in this section specified."

Mr. RUCKER. That amendment will perfect that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous

consent to return to that section for the purpose of offering the following amendment, which I will ask to have read.

The clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 7, page 3, the words "and habitual drunkards."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to return to section 2 of the bill for the purpose of offering the amendment which the clerk has read. Is there objection?

Mr. SHATTUC. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio objects. The Chair will state that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is a new section, known as section 3. The Clerk will now proceed to read section 3 of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the importation into the United States of any woman for the purposes of prostitution is hereby forbidden; and whoever shall knowingly and willfully import or attempt to import any woman into the United States for the purposes of prostitution, or shall knowingly or willfully hold or attempt to hold any woman for such purposes in pursuance of such illegal importation or contract or agreement, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be imprisoned not less than one nor more than five years and pay a fine not exceeding \$5,000.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk, to come in as two independent sections. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend between lines 24 and 25, page 4, by adding two sections, as follows:

"SEC. 4. That it shall hereafter be unlawful for any male alien who has not in good faith made his declaration before the proper court of his intention to become a citizen of the United States to be employed on any public works of the United States, or to come regularly or habitually into the United States by land or water for the purpose of engaging in any mechanical trade or manual labor, for wages or salary, returning from time to time to a foreign country.

"SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful for any person, partnership, company, or corporation knowingly to employ any alien coming into the United States in violation of the next preceding section of this act: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to the employment of sailors, deck hands, or other employees of vessels, or railroad train hands, such as conductors, engineers, brakemen, firemen, or baggagemen, whose duties require them to pass over the frontier to reach the termini of their runs, or to boatmen or guides on the lakes and rivers on the northern border of the United States, or citizens of countries in North America."

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, that amendment, with the exception of the last three or four words—

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Immigration, has already reserved a point of order.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is the parliamentary situation? If I understand it, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SNOODGRASS] offered an additional section. Now, the gentleman from Michigan offers two additional sections. His amendment is not an amendment to the one offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee was a section before section 3 of the bill. Section 3 of the bill has now been read. No amendment being offered to that section, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] was recognized to offer an amendment covering two sections to follow section 3 of the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. I thought some gentleman offered the substitute previously offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOLT] as a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. That was voted down.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Michigan can not offer two sections at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state, in response to the gentleman from Illinois, that a division may be demanded on the amendment and only one section be voted on at a time.

Mr. CORLISS. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman. That amendment, with the exception of the last three or four words, is identical with the bill that passed this House and the Senate in the Fifty-fourth Congress. It covers the two sections having reference to what are known as "birds of passage." Now, it was shown in the debate on that bill in the Fifty-fourth Congress that many thousands of able-bodied men, who are aliens, come to this country between the 1st of March and the 1st of December every year, many of them skilled artisans, earning in the aggregate millions of dollars, and, having families in foreign lands, take the fruits of labor in this country to their foreign homes at the end of each labor season. It was shown by the statistics from the immigration department that from 50,000 to 75,000 persons in different years come for that purpose.

These two sections were incorporated in that bill, and I have cut them out bodily. That bill was vetoed by President Cleveland. I have amended the section by adding the words "or citizens of countries of North America," making an exception of such persons. I want the Clerk to read the reference of Presi-

dent Cleveland to this paragraph, showing the only objection that he made to this provision. As will be observed, President Cleveland's only objection was that the provision barred out citizens of adjoining countries, and I have eliminated that feature.

The Clerk read as follows:

When we consider these provisions of the bill in connection with our long northern frontier and the boundaries of our States and Territories, often but an imaginary line separating them from the British Dominion, and recall the friendly intercourse between the people who are neighbors on either side, the provisions of this bill affecting them must be regarded as illiberal, narrow, and un-American.

The residents of these States and Territories have separate and especial interests which in many cases make an interchange of labor between their people and their alien neighbors most important, frequently with the advantage largely in favor of our citizens. This suggests the inexpediency of Federal interference with these conditions when not necessary to the correction of a substantial evil affecting the general welfare. Such unfriendly legislation as is proposed could hardly fail to provoke retaliatory measures, to the injury of many of our citizens who now find employment on adjoining foreign soil.

Mr. CORLISS. Now, Mr. Chairman, President Cleveland called attention to the possible evil of the bill in that it might affect citizens of Canada and Mexico, countries contiguous to our own. That was the only objection he made to the paragraph. In the amendment that I have offered I expressly except citizens of countries adjoining ours in North America.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. CORLISS. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. If you have excepted all on our northern and southern borders, who are left?

Mr. CORLISS. I will say to the gentleman that I have statistics from the Immigration Bureau which show that not less than 15,000 Europeans come into the port of New York and into Boston Harbor every spring and engage work about the coast as stone masons, bricklayers, and carpenters, as skilled artisans, earning from \$2 to \$5 a day, and at the end of the season they take the fruits of such labor to their foreign homes on foreign soil; every American labor organization in this country has asked Congress to recognize this evil and to stop it. You say you desire to stop immigration. Here is an opportunity to protect American labor, and American labor has asked us to unite on some immigration bill that will stop foreign aliens, nonresidents, from coming here to compete with him on our soil. This provision will protect them.

Mr. HEPBURN. I agree with what the gentleman stated, but these come from European points.

Mr. CORLISS. That is all my amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing.) But why exempt the Canadians and why exempt the Mexicans, when ten come from Canada to the United States for one that comes from a foreign port?

Mr. CORLISS. There is a good reason for exempting Canadians and Mexicans, because American interests are closely allied with theirs. The conditions by water and by rail are such as to necessitate a constant exchange of American citizens with Canadians. It does not particularly interfere with or menace the earnings of the laborer, as it did some years ago, not near as much, because the overflow of Canada is here now. Many young men of Canada have moved to our country and make the best citizens. Now, we want to stop the foreigner, the man in Europe and other lands, from coming here.

Mr. HEPBURN. In this debate from time to time I have heard the statement made that hundreds of thousands of Canadians come from Canada in the morning, take the place of some laborers of the United States during the day, and at night go back with the money and spend it over there.

Mr. CORLISS. Undoubtedly to some extent that is true; and it is true in my city and at Buffalo; but our citizens go there, and there is a distinction in effect that was seen and recognized; and appreciating the interest of labor, I have offered this amendment which eliminates the only possible objection that can be to it. It may interfere with the American citizens in Canada and in Mexico and not permit the free exchange between citizens of the United States and citizens of Canada, and between citizens of Mexico and the citizens of the United States, but it reaches the element which is the most dangerous and menacing to the labor of our country.

I can show you, for I have the statistics certified to by the immigration commissioner at Boston and New York, that 15,000 in one year entered those harbors and engaged employment as skilled laborers; that 75 per cent of them were men with families. I had the names of several who lived in Scotland and who every year for nearly fifteen years left their families in Scotland and came to the city of Boston and there worked in one factory as stone-cutters. They got \$5 a day. They were the best artisans of their trade. They did not live in this country. Their families were in Scotland. I had the names and the addresses and the facts to show that these men came here and engaged in work for four or

five months, living in boarding houses, cheap places, and taking the fruits of their labor in America back to their foreign families on foreign soil and there educate their children and there purchase the supplies necessary to support their families.

I want the House to recognize the interests of American labor, who have asked repeatedly for this provision and who protested against the veto. To avoid any complications I have added the exception with reference to citizens of the two countries, Canada and Mexico, and I sincerely hope that there will be no objection to this provision.

Mr. WEEKS. Men come from Windsor over to Detroit to find employment there, and I would like to ask if the gentleman's amendment covers that?

Mr. CORLISS. It does not affect that question at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] by striking out the words "citizens of any country in North America." If there is any wisdom at all in the amendment that the gentleman has offered, and I think there is, it consists in this: That no foreign citizen that has no intention of becoming an American citizen shall come here and crowd an American laborer out of his job and take the proceeds of his labor back to his foreign home and enjoy them there. If that is a sound position, and I think it is, no man can give a good reason why a Canadian or a Mexican shall be permitted to cross the border, come here and earn wages, crowd out an American laborer and take his wages back to his foreign home and enjoy them in Canada or Mexico any more than he can come over from England, Germany, Russia, or the Lord knows where.

Indeed, the reason of the rule applies more to Canadians and Mexicans than it does to the other nationalities, because it is easier for them to get in here; and the proposition of the gentleman from Michigan illustrates the evil of making exceptions to the general rule. If you say that no foreigner shall come here, crowd out one of our laborers and take his earnings out of the country—and they do it by the thousands—you can go before an intelligent constituency and stand on it, but I would like very much to see any man in this House address an intelligent audience in the United States and undertake to defend the proposition that foreign laborers not intending to become citizens shall come in and crowd out an American from his job and take his wages away from him, unless they be Canadians or unless they be Mexicans, in which two cases they may come in ad libitum.

Mr. CORLISS. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. CORLISS. Are you not aware that the character of the laborer and his wages in Canada are relatively very much higher than the laborer of Europe?

Mr. CLARK. That may be true.

Mr. CORLISS. And that the demand for labor in Canada is much higher, and that therefore the danger of the laborer from European competition is greater than that of Canada?

Mr. CLARK. That is partly true and partly not true. The traditional American position is in favor of welcoming honest, industrious, moral, healthy, law-abiding white people who come to this country to become citizens and establish homes—to remain here and to become part and parcel of us. Many of our best citizens are foreign-born persons and their children; but the laborers of this country do not believe anybody who does not intend to become an American citizen has a right to come over here and stay and labor in this country and earn wages and take them back to the foreign country and there spend them.

If you would add this amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, as amended by my amendment, to this bill it will keep out nine-tenths of the undesirable people that come to this country simply to make money without becoming citizens, because the statistics of the last census show, notwithstanding the flood of immigration in the country, in 1900 there were fewer people in the country of foreign birth, and fewer people one remove from foreign birth, than there were in 1880; and there is not a man living that can give any reason for an exception to this proposition in favor of Canadians and Mexicans.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I want to be consistent, and I want to pass this bill. This putting on of so many riders will have a tendency to hurt the bill. Without discussing the merits of these amendments I want to get rid of them, because I want the bill to finally pass the House and the Senate, and therefore I insist on the point of order that the amendments are not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] submits an amendment, or rather two amendments, in the form of two sections, to which the point of order was made and reserved by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC]. The debate has been exhausted, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] calls for a decision on the point of order.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the point of order, but I want to address myself to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri for the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first dispose of the point of order made upon these two amendments. The bill before the House is a bill regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States. The scope of the measure is exceedingly broad, and any amendment relating directly to the general scope and intent of the bill would be germane.

These amendments bring in an entirely new subject not alluded to in the bill, but relating to contract labor and contract-labor laws. If the Chair did not feel convinced in his own mind on this point of order, he would feel inclined to follow the decision made by Mr. Speaker Reed in the Fifty-fourth Congress, which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] will undoubtedly recall. On an immigration bill similar to the pending bill amendments similar to the pending amendments were offered, and points of order were made against them. The points of order were sustained by Mr. Reed on the ground that the amendments relating to contract labor were not germane to an immigration bill. In view of the precedent established by Mr. Speaker Reed, and in accordance with what seems to the Chair to be correct parliamentary practice, the point of order is sustained on the ground that the amendments are not germane to the subject-matter of the bill.

Mr. SHATTUC. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOUTELL reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12199) to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States and had come to no resolution thereon.

NATIONAL SANITARIUM AT SOLDIERS' HOME, HOT SPRINGS.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, by unanimous consent, called up from the Speaker's table the following concurrent resolution of the Senate; which was read, considered, and adopted.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Committee on Enrolled Bills, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 586) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a national sanitarium of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota, are hereby authorized to strike out the words "Branch Home" from line 12, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the word "sanitarium."

LIFE-SAVING STATION AT MONOMOY ISLAND, MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. LOVERING. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13168) to establish an additional life-saving station on Monomoy Island, Massachusetts.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to establish an additional life-saving station on Monomoy Island, Massachusetts, at such point as the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service may recommend.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Has this bill been reported by any committee of the House?

Mr. LOVERING. It has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I should like to know how much expense is involved?

Mr. LOVERING. Practically no expense. It is simply for the reestablishment of a station which it was contemplated to abandon, but recent disasters have proved that it is necessary to have this station reestablished.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The bill provides for no expenditure whatever, as I understand.

Mr. LOVERING. None but for mere repairs. That is all.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What is the necessity, may I ask, for the passage of the bill?

Mr. LOVERING. The necessity for the reestablishment of this station grows out of the recent disaster at Monomoy Island, where 12 lives were lost. It has been proved that had this station been in operation at the time there would have been no loss of life. There were more lives and more property rescued on this island than at any other point in the whole United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. LOVERING. I ask unanimous consent that a bill which has passed the Senate, absolutely identical with this House bill, be substituted.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. As I understand, the Senate bill is identical?

Mr. LOVERING. It is.

The SPEAKER. Has the Senate bill been reported back from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? It does not seem to be in the possession of the Clerk.

Mr. LOVERING. Then I ask that the House bill be passed. The question being taken, the bill of the House was passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill No. 5406.

The bill (S. 5406) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River from the mainland of Aiken County, S. C., to the mainland of Richmond County, Ga., was read.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. MERCER. I ask unanimous consent that the House non-concur in the amendments of the Senate to House bill 14018, the public-buildings bill.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. MERCER, Mr. GILLET of New York, and Mr. BANKHEAD as conferees on the part of the House.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the following committee assignments:

District of Columbia—Mr. McANDREWS of Illinois.

Library—Mr. McCLELLAN of New York.

Labor—Mr. RYAN of New York.

Expenditures in the Department of Justice—Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Immigration and Naturalization—Mr. FLOOD of Virginia.

Claims—Mr. GOOCH of Kentucky, and Mr. RHEA of Virginia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RANDELL of Texas, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. GAINES of West Virginia, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SCOTT, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois, for this week, on account of illness.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSE RULES.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee calls up the following privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution numbered 266, have had the same under consideration and report in lieu thereof the following:

"Resolved, That the following be added to the rules of the House as section 2 of Rule XXIX:

"It shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until such report and the accompanying statement shall have been printed in the RECORD, except on either of the six days preceding the end of a session."

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this substitute is for the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. It simply provides that conference reports must be first printed in the daily RECORD before they are to be called up for consideration in the House. It does not affect their privileged character when called up, but simply postpones their consideration until they shall have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The exception is made in favor of the last six days of the session, because at that time it is supposed we may be more or less hurried, and the exception is made that those reports will not have to be first printed.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. McRAE. I would ask if the gentleman does not think, if we are to have these printed, that they should be printed in bill form. Printing a report in the RECORD does not show us at once what the committee has done.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. We not only print the report in the RECORD, but the rule requires the printing of the accompanying statement.

Mr. McRAE. When a long conference report is printed in the RECORD, it often takes a man half a day to get at what is done. In bill form it would be of some use to us. I think the printing of it would be of no benefit practically unless it is printed in bill form, to show what is done and proposed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would state to my friend from Arkansas that the object of printing the report in the RECORD is to call the attention of the House to what the conferees have done.

Mr. McRAE. I understand that, yes; but unless attention is called to what is done by printing the amendments and changes proposed we can not tell whether the report is correct or not.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is right there for them to see.

Mr. McRAE. You may take a conference report on any of the large appropriation bills, and I undertake to say there are not ten men in the House who in half a day can tell what it means by reading the report in the RECORD. It will take considerable time to ascertain what these amendments mean unless they are printed in bill form in connection with the text of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman will observe that this requires the printing of the accompanying statement, and it is the statement which gives the information, anyway, as to what the report of the conferees includes. I think there will be no difficulty. It will be just as easy to make the comparison with the printed copy in the RECORD as if it were in bill form.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does this provide that the conference report shall be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Upon presentation, without asking unanimous consent?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. They shall be printed; yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Does it say they shall be printed in the RECORD? Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will ask that the Clerk report the rule again. I so understood it.

Mr. CANNON. They are always printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. They are when called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the Clerk will again report the resolution.

The Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Upon presentation of a conference report, is it a matter of right that it shall be printed in the RECORD, without an order of the House?

The SPEAKER. It is an absolute duty under this rule, the Chair thinks.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It can not be considered until it is.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if the exception there is not too ample. Originally, as the resolution was introduced, it made an exception of those reports that were made during the last three days of the session, and the reason for that was the statement that often the business was perhaps purposely delayed on the part of some person until the last few days for the very purpose, possibly, of the House not having as full an understanding as it otherwise might. I do not know that that was his language, but it was the inference that I drew, and I am fearful that as the rush comes just at the last we are going to have too much room in that exception, and I would prefer the resolution as it originally read.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understand that the question is addressed to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. The resolution says six days. Now, in the last six days it is in order to move to suspend the rules, as the gentleman is aware. I do not consider it very important whether it is three days or six days. I should have been entirely content if it had been three days instead of six, because if there had been any special pressure the House undoubtedly would suspend the rules for the first three days of the six. There is an abuse almost unavoidable that is liable to happen in the last six days or the last three days of the session, when everything is crowding for consideration, and you do as much business ordinarily in six days as you would do in a month or six weeks at another stage of the session. I would be perfectly willing to see it three days instead of six.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman in charge of the measure to one possible difficulty, and ask him what he thinks about this: In the last Congress, if I remember right, there were no last six days. There was only one of those days.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. You mean in the long session?

Mr. LACEY. In the long session. In other words, in the long session, until a resolution of adjournment has passed the two Houses, we do not know when the six days will begin, and in the last long session we did not agree to the adjournment resolution until the last day. Consequently, there were no last six days. Might this not give us some trouble?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will state to the gentleman that the Committee on Rules considered that very carefully.

That was suggested while the committee were considering this proposed rule, and we thought that if the difficulty which the gentleman from Iowa suggests should arise that the Committee on Rules could very well bring in a proposition to vacate this rule during the remainder of the session. We could obviate the difficulty by simply bringing in a rule abrogating this rule for the remainder of the session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bills of the following titles:

H. R. 307. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Branson;
H. R. 671. An act granting an increase of pension to Orra H. Heath;
H. R. 1046. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin;
H. R. 1129. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Shaffer;
H. R. 1695. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Perry;
H. R. 1696. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick A. Condon;
H. R. 1715. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Hudson, formerly Henry P. Dow;
H. R. 1724. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Thompson;
H. R. 2661. An act granting an increase of pension to Oswald Ahlstedt;
H. R. 2563. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Strong;
H. R. 3238. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Weeks;
H. R. 3292. An act granting an increase of pension to Arthur H. Perkins;
H. R. 4451. An act granting an increase of pension to George K. Thompson;
H. R. 5020. An act granting an increase of pension to Courtland C. Matson;
H. R. 5219. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Donne;
H. R. 5865. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Campbell;
H. R. 5911. An act granting an increase of pension to Gilbert G. Gabrion;
H. R. 6063. An act granting an increase of pension to John Brill;
H. R. 6172. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Weimer;
H. R. 6721. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Ray;
H. R. 6750. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Hoxie;
H. R. 7228. An act granting an increase of pension to Christian Christianson;
H. R. 7229. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Dunning;
H. R. 7401. An act granting an increase of pension to William Brown;
H. R. 7897. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Daly;
H. R. 7918. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Pettee;
H. R. 8106. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Mahoney;
H. R. 8401. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Murphy;
H. R. 8409. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrenus Larrabee;
H. R. 10488. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate W. Milward;
H. R. 10821. An act granting an increase of pension to Abby T. Daniels;
H. R. 11133. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Lafferty;
H. R. 11170. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kunselman;
H. R. 12978. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Smith;
H. R. 13019. An act granting an increase of pension to Marietta Elizabeth Stanton;
H. R. 13036. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Greenhalgh;

H. R. 13371. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Palmer;

H. R. 12054. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Burrill;
H. R. 750. An act granting a pension to Martin Essex;
H. R. 3329. An act granting a pension to Mary Ann Merrow;
H. R. 4089. An act granting a pension to Ada L. McFarland;
H. R. 4204. An act granting a pension to Hester A. Furr;
H. R. 5553. An act granting a pension to Nancy E. Hardy;
H. R. 5554. An act granting a pension to Egbert A. Stricksma;
H. R. 6021. An act granting a pension to William Kaste;
H. R. 6663. An act granting a pension to John York;
H. R. 7085. An act granting a pension to Hannah H. Graham;
H. R. 7541. An act granting a pension to Annie Shinn;
H. R. 8341. An act granting a pension Hannah C. Chase; and
H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution fixing the time when a certain provision of the Indian appropriation act for the year ending June 30, 1903, shall take effect.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER also, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8587. An act for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes;
H. R. 8466. An act granting a pension to Lucinda A. Sirwell;
H. R. 8921. An act granting increase of pension to Jesse C. Rhodabeck;
H. R. 9226. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth I. Ogden;
H. R. 9249. An act granting a pension to Amos Allport;
H. R. 9437. An act granting increase of pension to Elias A. Calkins;
H. R. 9569. An act granting increase of pension to Albert Deits;
H. R. 9926. An act granting increase of pension to James F. Patton;
H. R. 9928. An act granting a pension to Benjamin E. Styles;
H. R. 10165. An act granting increase of pension to Delia E. Slocum;
H. R. 10201. An act granting increase of pension to Otis R. Freeman;
H. R. 10731. An act granting increase of pension to Samuel P. Milburn;
H. R. 11285. An act granting increase of pension to William Sheldon;
H. R. 11343. An act granting a pension to Mary Louise Lowry;
H. R. 11644. An act granting increase of pension to Edgar A. Hamilton;
H. R. 11921. An act granting increase of pension to George W. De Graw;
H. R. 12012. An act granting increase of pension to Walter C. Tuttle;
H. R. 12458. An act granting increase of pension to William M. Barstow;
H. R. 12685. An act granting a pension to Hiram J. Springfield;
H. R. 12778. An act granting increase of pension to Edward R. Blain;
H. R. 12780. An act granting increase of pension to William H. Wheeler;
H. R. 13132. An act granting increase of pension to Annie Cotter;
H. R. 13162. An act granting increase of pension to Augustin M. Adams;
H. R. 13249. An act granting increase of pension to Ada Trowbridge;
H. R. 13266. An act granting increase of pension to Elbert M. Remson;
H. R. 13265. An act granting increase of pension to John Whalen;
H. R. 13350. An act granting a pension to Presley P. Medlin;
H. R. 13503. An act granting increase of pension to Charles Haltenhof;
H. R. 13807. An act granting a pension to Jeremiah Horan;
H. R. 13822. An act granting a pension to Hannah T. Knowles;
H. R. 14099. An act granting a pension to Samantha B. Van Brocklin; and
H. R. 12562. An act granting increase of pension to William H. Temple.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 3848. An act granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all the right, title, and interest in and to certain lands in the city of Newport, R. I.;
S. 3129. An act for the authorization of the erection of buildings by the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations on military reservations of the United States;

S. 3666. An act to authorize the sale of a part of the Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, in the State of Nebraska;

S. R. 46. Joint resolution to provide for the printing of 6,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893 to 1901, inclusive; and

S. 173. An act for the relief of the owners of the British ship Foscolia and cargo.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for various deficiencies—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Spencer Vaughan, administrator of estate of Asa Tucker, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11656) to incorporate The Society of the Army of Santiago de Cuba, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2187); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3108) to provide a home for aged and infirm colored people, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2188); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MUDD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 87) to permit steam railroads in the District of Columbia to occupy additional parts of streets in order to accommodate the traveling public attending the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in October, 1902, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2191); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 493) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2192); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13233) granting a pension to William A. Nelson, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2174); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13178) granting a pension to William F. Bowden, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2175); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROMWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8644) granting a pension to John W. Thomas, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2176); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11893) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Dennis, of Turin, Coweta County, Ga., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2177); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14224) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Tod, reported the same with

amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2178); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BALL of Texas, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14251) granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. Reynolds, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2179); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SELBY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14234) granting a pension to John Williamson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2180); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14359) granting a pension to Luther G. Edwards, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2181); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2783) granting a pension to William Dixon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2182); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5202) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Wagner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2183); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5152) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus M. M. Martin, alias Marion M. Martin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2184); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13683) granting an increase of pension to Ella S. Mannix, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2185); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2186) granting an increase of pension to Hattie M. Whitney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2186); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13536) for the payment of C. Edward Artist, Edward F. Stahle, and Stahle & Artist of balances due for surveying public lands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2189); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6414) granting an increase of pension to William W. H. Davis, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2190); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 14644) for the erection of an equestrian statue to the memory of Baron Steuben at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 14645) to amend chapter 11 of the laws of 1897, entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 14647) relating to future contracts in agricultural products—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LATIMER: A bill (H. R. 14648) for the relief of the Interstate and West Indian Exposition, in the city of Charleston, S. C.—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 14690) providing for the erection of a monument at Cowpens battle ground, Cherokee County, S. C., commemorative of Gen. Daniel Morgan and those who participated in the battle of Cowpens on the 30th day of January, 1781—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LACEY: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 52) to rescind the passage of House concurrent resolution No. 15, authorizing the printing of "The Morals of Jesus of Nazareth," by Thomas Jefferson—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. METCALF: A bill (H. R. 14646) to renew and extend certain letters patent—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 14649) granting a pension to Dilana B. Fitts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 14650) granting a pension to Francis M. Hassler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 14651) granting a pension to Rudolph Kals—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 14652) granting an increase of pension to Thomas I. Madge—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 14653) granting an increase of pension to William L. Reck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 14654) granting an increase of pension to John Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 14655) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14656) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 14657) granting a pension to Mrs. M. A. Durkee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14658) granting a pension to John M. Leader—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14659) granting a pension to Harriett A. Tappan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14660) granting an increase of pension to Mary (Fox) Everett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14661) granting an increase of pension to Lieut. Benjamin C. Harter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14662) granting an increase of pension to John Dick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14663) granting an increase of pension to James F. Cosgro—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14664) granting an increase of pension to James Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14665) granting an increase of pension to William W. Herron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14666) granting an increase of pension to John Tanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14667) granting an increase of pension to John H. Volckmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14668) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Small—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14669) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Charnock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14670) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Heaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14671) granting an increase of pension to Franklin De R. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14672) granting an increase of pension to G. K. Glenn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14673) granting an increase of pension to Albert E. Meigs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14674) for the relief of Sarah A. Cady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14675) to correct the military record of Henry S. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14676) to correct the military record of Peter L. Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14677) to correct the military record of George Hare, alias Frank Waters, alias George F. Waters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14678) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14679) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles R. Stevens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14680) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Fairman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14681) to remove charge of desertion against Benjamin F. Moore, alias Henry F. Hunt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 14682) granting a pension to Georgiana Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14683) granting a pension to Rosa Gudgeon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14684) granting an increase of pension to David W. Swigert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14685) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Madison Waldron—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14686) for the relief of John Till—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 14687) granting a pension to Margaret Brennan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 14688) granting a pension to Harriet S. Packard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14689) to grant American registry to the steamship Arab—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of bill (H. R. 10793) forbidding railroad officials to separate passengers on account of race or color—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petition of H. Lachtrop and other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging the passage of a service pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: Statement of Rev. G. E. Strobbridge, relative to the status of chaplains of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Resolution of W. M. Rogers Post, No. 159, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ladelle, S. Dak., favoring the construction of Government vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CROMER: Resolutions of Trades Council of Anderson, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Roosevelt Republican Club, of Yonkers, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Resolutions of Central Federated Union, indorsing bill to prohibit enlisted men in the service of the United States competing with civilians—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolutions of the New York Produce Exchange, Stereotypers' Union No. 1, Social Reform Club, New Century Club, and Chambre de Commerce Française, of New York City, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Resolutions of Melville Thomas Post, No. 515, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, in support of House bill granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Kennedy—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HANBURY: Papers to accompany House bill 14480, to remove the charge of desertion against the record of George W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN: Paper to accompany House bill 3742, granting an increase of pension to Lafayette L. Griffiths—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Louisville, Ky., in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12318, to correct the military record of Conrad Brandaberry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON: Petition of A. B. Woodruff and 49 other citizens of South Carolina, praying for cheaper postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petitions of Commercial Dock Store, Tacoma Fish Company, R. W. Jamieson, and others, of Tacoma, Wash., in relation to gasoline-propelled launches—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, in favor of a law to pension men of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 14032, granting a pension to Gustav Jansen—to the Committee on Pension.

Also, resolution of Merchants' Association of San Francisco, favoring the payment of the claims of Hawaiian citizens whose property was destroyed in the effort to stamp out the bubonic plague in 1899 and 1900—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of Bottlers' Union No. 190, of Lawrence, Mass., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of Ocean Lodge, No. 76, Locomotive Firemen, Norfolk, Va., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Resolutions of the trustees of the Free Public Library of Hoboken, N. J., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the correction of the military record of P. L. Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers in support of House bill granting a pension to Mary Fox, now Everett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: Papers to accompany House bill 12570, granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Beezley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 12516, granting a pension to J. H. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Resolutions of Carpenters' Union No. 501, of East Stroudsburg, Pa., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of F. W. Bell Circle, No. 107, Easton, Pa., Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of General J. Kilpatrick Post, No. 233, Sons of Veterans, Easton, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of United Mine Workers' Unions Nos. 1595, of Beaver Meadow; 1494, of Colerain, and 1745, of Summit Hill, Pa., favoring the prohibition of immigrants other than wives and children who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of Abraham Heed and others, of Montgomery County, Ohio, favoring the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany House bill 14631, granting an increase of pension to Henry Jeffers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John Till, of Lauderdale County, Ala., for reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolution of Central Federated Union of New York, in reference to the employment of enlisted men in competition with local civilians—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of citizens of Kane, Pa., and other places, asking that certain kinds of meat be placed upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Journeymen Barbers' Union of Glade Run, Pa., in relation to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Central Federated Union of New York, indorsing the bill prohibiting enlisted men in the service of the United States competing with civilians—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of Justus H. Wright and others, in the State of Massachusetts, in relation to jurors' fees in the United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Dudley Donnelly Post, No. 133, of Niagara Falls, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, for the passage of a bill to modify and simplify the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of 570 members of the Union Veteran Legion of Floyd County, Ind., praying for the passage of the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), petition of Cherokee Nation, praying for appropriation to pay claim against the United States, in compliance with findings of Court of Claims—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 23, 1902.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

DISTRICT INDUSTRIAL HOME SCHOOL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut) laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the additional sum of \$3,000 for the enlargement of the girls' dormitories of the Industrial Home School, District of Columbia, together with the reappropriation of \$5,000 for this purpose, provided by the District appropriation act of March 1, 1901; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

A bill (S. 173) for the relief of the owners of the British ship Foscolia and cargo;

A bill (S. 3129) for the authorization of the erection of buildings by the international committee of Young Men's Christian Associations on military reservations of the United States;

A bill (S. 3666) to authorize the sale of a part of the Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, in the State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 3848) granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all the right, title, and interest in and to certain land in the city of Newport, R. I.;

A bill (H. R. 8466) granting a pension to Lucinda A. Sirwell;

A bill (H. R. 8587) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8921) granting increase of pension to Jesse C. Rhodaback;

A bill (H. R. 9226) granting a pension to Elizabeth I. Ogden;

A bill (H. R. 9249) granting a pension to Amos Allport;

A bill (H. R. 9437) granting increase of pension to Elias A. Calkins;

A bill (H. R. 9569) granting increase of pension to Albert Deits;

A bill (H. R. 9926) granting increase of pension to James F. Patton;

A bill (H. R. 9928) granting a pension to Benjamin E. Styles;

A bill (H. R. 10165) granting increase of pension to Delia E. Slocum;

A bill (H. R. 10201) granting increase of pension to Otis R. Freeman;

A bill (H. R. 10731) granting increase of pension to Samuel P. Milburn;

A bill (H. R. 11285) granting increase of pension to William Sheldon;

A bill (H. R. 11343) granting a pension to Mary Louise Lowry;

A bill (H. R. 11644) granting a pension to Edgar A. Hamilton;

A bill (H. R. 11921) granting increase of pension to George W. De Graw;

A bill (H. R. 12012) granting increase of pension to Walter C. Tuttle;

A bill (H. R. 12453) granting increase of pension to William M. Barstow;

A bill (H. R. 12562) granting increase of pension to William H. Temple;

A bill (H. R. 12685) granting a pension to Hiram J. Springfield;

A bill (H. R. 12778) granting increase of pension to Edward R. Blain;

A bill (H. R. 12780) granting increase of pension to William H. Wheeler;

A bill (H. R. 13132) granting increase of pension to Annie Cotter;

A bill (H. R. 13162) granting increase of pension to Augustin M. Adams;

A bill (H. R. 13249) granting increase of pension to Ada Trowbridge;

A bill (H. R. 13265) granting increase of pension to John Whalen;

A bill (H. R. 13268) granting increase of pension to Elbert N. Remson;

A bill (H. R. 13350) granting a pension to Presley P. Medlin;

A bill (H. R. 13503) granting increase of pension to Charles Haltenhof;

A bill (H. R. 13807) granting a pension to Jeremiah Horan;

A bill (H. R. 13822) granting a pension to Hannah T. Knowles;

A bill (H. R. 14099) granting a pension to Samantha B. Van Brocklin; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 46) to provide for the printing of 6,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893 to 1901, inclusive.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented the petition of Owen Hoep and 31 other citizens of Ragged Top, S. Dak., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the internal-revenue law relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fairhaven, Vt., praying for the repeal of the tariff duties on beef, veal, mutton, and pork; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Lumpers, Boxers, and Derrick Men's Local Union No. 9584, American Federation of Labor, of Barre, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of